# DIATRIBE TRIPLEX:

OR A

# Threefold Exercitation,

Concerning

1. *Superſtition.*
2. *Will-worſhip.*
3. *Chriſtmas Feſtivall.*

With the Reverend and Learned

Dr HAMMOND.

BY

*Dauiel Cawdrey* Preacher of the Word, at *Billing-Magn.* in *Northampton-ſhire.*

Col. 2. 4. 8.

4. *This I ſay leaſt any man ſhould beguile you, with enticing words.*

8. *Beware leaſt any man ſpoyle you, through Philoſophie, and vaine deceit, after the Tradition of men, after the rudiments of the World, and not after Chriſt.*

*LONDON,*

Printed for *John Wright* at the Kings-Head in the *Old-Bayley.* 1654.

# The Preface.

WHat was ſaid of old, "That in the accuſation of Hereſie, no man ought to be ſilent; may well be applyed to a charge of Superſtition, and Will-worſhip, The one is a crime againſt the Truth of God, the other two againſt the worſhip of God; and the queſtion is, which is the greater ſinne, "To corrupt the Doctrine, or the worſhip? That, Hereſie is a great and a damnable ſinne, all men confeſſe; That Superſtition, and Will-worſhip, are as criminall, and abhominable to God, (though ſome men attempt them rather their vertues, than their crimes,) is as demonſtrable; and hath been demonſtrated elſe-where. The words (and things imported by them) have ſo long heard ill, in the Reformed Churches, that men muſt either deny themſelves guilty of the things, or ſtudy to defend, and vindicate the words from the evill ſenſe and ſavour put upon them. The Reverend Doctor (with whom I deale) takes it very hainouſly, "that the crimes of Superſtition and will-worſhip, ſhould bee "charged upon the late Government and Diſcipline of the Church, and the ceremonies "and obſervances, either preſcribed or cuſtomary "among us. Particularly, that any ſhould charge "his Chriſtmas Feſtivall (as it was of late ob- "ſerved) with thoſe two crimes, beſides the Riot attending on it. He will not (by his good will) grant, that δεισιδαιμονία, or θελοθρησκία, that is, Superſtition and wil-worſhip, in the Scriptures, are to be taken in an ill notion; much leſſe to bee

Pref. to 6. tracts.

Of Feſt: ſ. 26.

accounted crimes; or if they be so, to be justly charged, upon his Christmas Festivity. And no mervail, if the matter be as he makes it seem to be; For first, for Superstition he saies, "it is most clearly
Of Superst. sect. 2. "according to the use of the word, Superstitum "cultus, the worship of some departed from this "World, alive in another, which though he grants, "justly charged on Heathens and Pa-"pists, and properly called Superstition; Yet not on Protestants at all: Or if Protestants be guilty of any Superstition, it is only of one kind, that is,
Sect. 46, 47, 48. "To affirm (as a false Teacher) God to com-"mand, when he doth not command, or to "forbid when he doth not forbid. And secondly, as for Will-worship, thats far from a crime, in his opinion; its nothing but volnntary worship, as innocent, as the Free will-offerings, allowed by God in the time of the Law; "the more volun-
Sect. 9. "tary, the more acceptable. Which assertions, if they be true; it will be easie for him, to vindicate his Festivities, from those charges laid against them, as the grounds of laying them aside. But that I may, at once and together, both shew and remove the grounds of the Reverend Doctors mistakes, and facilitate the way to the reading of the following Discourses; I shall here very briefly recapitulate, what I suppose to be the causes of his Miscarriages, in this whole business. And they are these four mistakings.

1. That a man cannot be too Religious: This he confidently asserts, Sect. 33. both of the intention or degree, and of the extension or number of rites and ceremonies, taken into the worship of God, Sect. 34. A distinction or two, will cleare the way. A man may be said to be too Religious, either be-

cause

cause he gives more to God than he deserves, but so he cannot be too Religious; or because he gives more than he requires, by the rule of worship; and so a man may be too Religious. 2. In regard of worship commanded, especially naturall worship, a man cannot be too Religious, in reference to the intention of the Devotion; as in love, fear, trust in God: (though in instituted worship, a man may be too Religious: as if he pray, or Fast to the wasting of his health, or neglect of his calling, &c.) But in uncommanded worship, the least addition to the Rule of Worship, is too much, and such a man, may be said to be too Religious. This I prove.

1. If a man, or Church, may adde to the Rule of Religion, then he, or they may be too Religious. But a man or Church may adde to the Rule of Religion, ergo. The consequence is clear. The assumption is proved by Deut. 4. 2. where all Additions to the word are prohibited.

2. Religion, (saies the great Schoolman) is a morall virtue (or very like it) and stands between 2. extremes; ergo. a man may as well be too much Religious, as too little.

3. The Doctor himselfe grants there may be a Niciety or excesse of Religion, in "adding to the "commands of Christ, the Gospell rule, "those things which belong not to it, and so is "not an exceeder in the feare and service of "God. Of Superst. sect. 46. And this is the first ground of the Doctors mistake.

2. The second is, "That excesse in Religion, is "not well called Superstition; or that Superstiti-"is on not an excesse of Religion. Sect. 27. &c. which is proved to be so.

1. *Because it is an* Addition *to the Rule of worship, and so an* excesse, *as* Superstatutum. *Though the originall of the Word was Heathenish to signifie* Superstitum cultus, *yet its well applyed by Divines, to those Additions made to the Rule of worship. That which the old Testament calls* Addition *to the Word, the new calls Doctrines, traditions of men,* VVil-worship *and* Superstition.

2. *As the* defect *in Religion is called* propha-nesse, *so the* excesse *is called* Superstition, *as standing in* opposition *to it.*

3. *By the Doctors own concessions. For first hee grants,* Superstitious *may denote such an* excesse *Sect* 31. 2. *The worship of Angells is an* excesse *or Addition to the* object *of worship, and by him stiled, that* crime *of Superstition.* 3. Superstitum cultus, *the worship of the worthies departed, by Heathens, or of Saints and Angells, by Papists, is called* Superstition, *Sect.* 3. *most properly, Why? but that it* addes *to the Rule of worship.* 4 Slavish fear *of God, is granted to be Superstition, because* Feare *of God, being worship commanded in the first Commandement, Slavish fear is an* excesse *of that Feare. sect.* 24. 25. 4. *To affirm God to command when he doth not, is granted to be Superstition,* "under the "notion of Nimiety or excesse, because that "man addes to the commands of Christ. *Sect* 46. 5. *To place more* vertue *in things, than God or nature hath put in them, is granted to be an* excess, *because it addes to the promises of Christ, and called Superstition. sect.* 45. *Thats the second ground of mistake.*

3. *The third is.* "That ἐθελοθρησκεία, or will-"worship, is nothing but voluntary worship, "as innocent as the Freewil-offering, &c.

*Which*

*Which seems a contradiction* in adjecto; "that "voluntary worship and uncommanded "should be innocent. *For* 1. *Its expresly against the second Commandement; which forbids all worship not* commanded *by God.* 2. *Voluntary Worship is an* Addition *to the Rule of worship, and eo nomine, Superstition, and thats sinfull.* 3. *Why is the worship of Angells, of Saints,* &c. criminall? *but because it was worship invented and added by the will of man; but thats granted to be sinfull. Yet they do not urge it as a Commandement of God.* 4. *If Wil-worship be innocent, I cannot see, how all that* rabble *of Superstitious worship at* Rome, *can be condemned; for they are not held out as Commandements of God, but as the* Traditions *of men.*

4. *The last ground of* Mistake *is, that the Doctor takes for granted,* "That a Church or particu- "lar person, hath power to institute & observe, worship not commanded by God. *Which remaines, upon him to prove; before he can vindicate his* Festivall, (*as he and others maintain it*) *from the double crime, of* Superstition, *and* Willworship: *which I prove by this one argument; If all Additions to the word in matter of* worship, *be criminous and sinfull, as prohibited by God* Deut. 4.2. *and elsewhere; then no man or Church can without sinne adde any worship, to that commanded by God; But the first is true:* ergo. *These* (*I take it*) *are the principall grounds of the Doctors* Misprisions, *and are more largely shewed in the Tracts themselves: To shut up this, If Superstition be an excesse of Religion,* (*as allready it is proved to be, and more hereafter*) *if* Willworship *or uncommanded worship, be an Addition to the Gospell Rule* (*as cannot well rationally be denyed*) *I see not how*

the

*the Doctor can* wash *his hands, or his* Holiday, *from thoſe two* crimes. *For he makes* "the conſe-"cration & obſervation of the day, to be a part "of (uncommanded) worſhip; the day to be "more holy than other daies; as holy as the "Lords day; places virtue in it by pleaſing "God by it, and of more acceptance becauſe voluntary, &c. (*all which and more, appeare in the* Tract *it ſelf*) *which if they be not* Additions, *and* exceſſes *againſt the ſecond and fourth Commandement; I leave to the judgement of the indifferent* Reader, *when he hath ſeriouſly conſidered and weighed, what hath been, and ſhall be ſpoken hereafter.*

# OF SVPERSTITION.

## Section 1.

IN a juſt and Methodicall *order* of Tranſlation, the Diſcourſe of *Superſtition* ſhould precede that of *Will-worſhip*; that being more generall, this laſt a *Special* under it. Which that we may diſcover, we ſhall (before we debate it with the Doctor) enquire, and (as well as we can) reſolve, what *Superſtition* is; And this cannot ſo well be found, by ſearching into the *Monuments* of Heathen Authors, *Latine* or *Greeke*, (which is the Doctors way) from the *Names* and ſenſes by them given; (they being apt to *miſleade* themſelves and us, in this ſearch,) as by the judgement of *Divines*, the matter belonging to *Religion*, the chiefe and laſt of all *Arts*: They that never knew what *true Religion* meant, are all judges of *Superſtition*, which is the worke and worker thereof, in the exceſſive part.

§. 2. *Superſtition*, in the generall notion of it, is not unfitly defined, by the learned *Schooleman*, "*A vice contrary to Religion*, "*in the exceſſe*, (as *profaneſſe* is the other *Aquin.* 22. q. 92. a. 1. c

contrary, in the *Defect.*) Not that a man can be *too Religious* indeed, in the commanded worship of God, with respect, or in order to the *formall vertue* of Religion; but (as one explaines himselfe) in order to the *Acts*, or externall *meanes* of worship, superadded by the wisdome, or *will* of man; "*when a man* "*tenders worship, either to whom it is not due,* "*or not in that manner, which he ought.* Now, in *Religion*, or *worship* of God in generall (as distinct from *Justice*, or *Charity* in the second Table,) foure things are considerable, according to the foure Commandments of the Table. 1 A right *Object*, God alone; 2 a right *Matter*, commanded worship; 3 a right *manner*, with all due *Reverence*; 4 a right *Time*, his owne appointed Day: and answerably *Superstition* may extend to the whole first *Table*, when there is a Nimiety, or *excesse* in any of these. For the *Discoverie* whereof, we must observe, that the Commandements of God, having every one of them, a *Negative*, and an *Affirmative* part, (expressed or understood) the Duties of *Religion* doe stand in the midst, as *vertues*, between two extremes: As *e. g.* there is a double *errour* against the first Commandement, one in the *Defect*, that's *Atheism*, having no God at all; the

Dr. *Ames. in medul. on second Commandment: Aquin.* ibid.

Superstition is that which adds humane indeavours to divine precepts. *Vrsin.* in 2 precept. More then is appointed by the law of God. D. *Fulk* in Act. 17. f. 4. Worship without Gods commandement. M. *Perk.* on the second Command.

the other in *exceſſe*, that is *Polytheiſm*, having too many. 2 In the ſecond Commandement, there is, firſt a *Defect*, not obſerving Gods *preſcribed* worſhip, than an *exceſſe*, in adding and obſerving *deviſed* worſhip. 3 So alſo in the third Commandement, there is a *Defect*, in want of *Reverence* due to the *Divine* Majeſty (which is ſometimes partly called *profaneſſe*) and an *exceſſe* in additions of *Ridiculous rites* and ceremonies or geſtures, and the like. 4. In the fourth Commandement, there is a *Defect*, in obſerving *no Time*, when Gods deſigned *Sabbath* is neglected, and an *exceſſe*, when men inſtitute other *Holy Dayes* and Times, as *Jeroboam* did, 1 *King.* 12. 32. "*He ordained a Feaſt, - like unto* "*the Feaſt that was in Judea.* Thence it is apparent, that in this generall *ſenſe*, there may be *Superſtition*, in, or againſt all the Commandements of the firſt Table, in the *exceſſive* part; and it were eaſie to obſerve, that many (Divines eſpecially) doe call the *exceſſes* of any Commandement, by the name of *Superſtition.*

§. 3. And hence it may appeare, that ſome are *too ſhort*, in deſigning the *Species* or kinds of *Superſtition*; As firſt the learned *Schooleman*; who makes but three kinds of it, "*Ido-* "*latry, Illegitimate worſhip, and Divination.* The firſt and laſt whereof, are referred by Divines to the firſt Commandement; and the o- Ibid *a.* 2. in *corp.*

other, *illegitimate* or uncommanded worſhip, to the ſecond: For *Idolatry*, properly ſo called, is either the worſhip of a *falſe God*, inſtead of the true; or of *many*, or other Gods with him: And *Divination*, being a conſulting with the Devill, is a giving of that *honour* to him, which is due onely to God, and ſo the worſt kind of Idolatry; So he limits *Superſtition*, only to two Commandements. But I find another Reverend Doctor, reſtraining it to one Commandement, *viz.* the *ſecond*, when he deſignes it thus. "*Superſtition* "*is* (*a vice*) *whereby undue worſhip is ten-* "*dered unto God.* Hee means that worſhip to be undue (which the *Schoolman* called *illegitimate*) which is not commanded by God, but inſtituted and appointed by men: But this limits it onely to the *ſecond* Commandement, which is more properly called, *VVillworſhip*, and is but one *Species* of Superſtition: Whereas there may be *Superſtition* againſt any of the four firſt Commandements. For inſtance: The worſhiping of *many* Gods, by the *Athenians*, and other Nations: againſt what Commandement was it? Surely againſt the *firſt*; yet this by the Apoſtles is called *Superſtition*, *Act.* 17. 22. I perceive you are δεισιδαιμονέστερους, too Superſtitious: "*He means* "(*ſaies our Doctor*) *they worſhiped more* "*Gods than other people.* And the *Worſhiping of Angells*, *Col.* 2.18. with the true God, is

D. *Ames. Medul.* on the ſecond Commandement.

ἐθελοθρησκία.

*Sect.* 11.

an

an *Exceſſe* againſt the firſt Commandement, yet by the Doctor himſelf, is called, *that crime of Superſtition.* Again, when *Baals* Prieſts uſed thoſe barbarous *Ceremonies* in their worſhip, *leaping* and *cutting* themſelves; and when *Papiſts* uſe as many and more ridiculous *Rites* and geſtures in their worſhip; this is an *Exceſſe* againſt the third Commandement, yet who would not call theſe *Superſtition*? as taking Gods *Name in vain.* And laſtly, when *Ieroboam* made a *Feaſt day* of his own head, and *Papiſts* dedicate *Holy daies* to Saints; yea when the *Iewes* were ſo ſcrupulous in obſerving their Sabbath, that they would not ſtand up to defend themſelves, were not theſe *Exceſſes* of Religion, againſt the fourth Commandement? yet juſtly called their Superſtition.

Willworſhip. *ſect.* 20.

So called by *Plutarch. ſect.* 19.

§. 4. *Superſtition* then, in this generall notion, as an *Exceſſe* of Religion, hath as many *ſpecies*, or kinds, as there are Commandements of the firſt Table; But it is no *eaſie* matter, to diſcover all the *kinds* and waies, whereby it is committed in particular; or when we have found them, punctually to determine to what Commandement they doe belong. And therefore the courteous *Reader* will eaſily pardon us, if we be not ſo *logically accurate*, as we would be in ſetting down the particular kinds. We ſhall labour to expreſſe ſome of them, as we find them held

out by *Divines* and others, upon ſeverall occaſions. There may be therefore 2. *Heads* of Superſtition.

§. 5. 1. *Negative*, when men abſtain from ſomethings, under a *notion of Religion*, or worſhip of God, which are not forbidden by God, but left free, and indifferent: either not forbidden, or, if once they were, now antiquated, or *outdated*, as our Doctor ſaies: And of this ſort was that, *Col.* 2. 21. "*Touch* "*not, taſt not, handle not*; which was *Superſtitious Negative willworſhip.*

§. 6. 2. *Poſitive*, when men of their owne hearts and *Heads*, ſet up *waies* of Religion, to *worſhip* God by, which he never commanded; And this, (as was ſaid) may be committed, againſt any of the four firſt Commandements. This *diſtinction*, the Doctor ownes, (of *Negative*, and *Poſitive Superſtition*,) and makes uſe of it againſt others hereafter, thus: "*In things indifferent, it is as criminous and ſuperſtitious, to place piety in the* "*Negative, as in the affirmative; in not* "*kneeling as in kneeling, in abſtaining ſcru-* "*pulouſly from ceremonies, as in uſing them* "*as ſcrupulouſly.* Thus farre then we have his conſent, for *more waies* than one, for men, at leſt Proteſtants to be *ſuperſtitious*; which hereafter he does almoſt deny: *Sect.* 47, 48. of which in its place. Now this *Poſitive* Superſtition, may be exemplified, in many particulars. Sect. 25.

§. 7

§. 7. 1. In that which is properly called δεισιδαιμονία, rendred by our Tranſlators, by *Superſtition*: *Act.* 25. 19. and elſewhere; And this may be, either when men worſhip many Gods, or onely one (with the true) and for this the *Athenians* are called too ſuperſtitious, *Act.* 17. 22. or elſe, when they have "*an exceſſe of fear, or being afraid of* "*God, when they need not, as thinking themſelves bound, as from God, when God neither commands, nor forbids; Of this kind,* "*is the doing or abſtaining Religiouſly* (i. e. "*upon pretence of Divine precept, or prohibition*) *from thoſe things, which the word* "*doth neither command, nor interdict.* They are the Doctors own words, *Sect.* 46. below. Onely he is ſhort, in ſhort expreſſing, *Religiouſly*, by pretence of *Divine precept*, or prohibition, for it ſignifies alſo, a pretence of worſhiping God thereby: When men have a *ſlaviſh fear*, or hard opinions of God, then they are juſtly called *Superſtitious.*

The worſhiping of theſe (as amongſt Papiſts) is moſt properly called Superſtition. *Sect.* 3.

§. 8. 2. That which is more ſtrictly called ἐθελοθρησκία, *Willworſhip*, which is, the placing the *Worſhip* of God, in thoſe things which are the meer *inventions*, and inſtitutions of men; never commanded by God: The *Papiſts* can give us inſtances enough; In the *Sacrifice* of the *Maſſe*, in *habits*, *Eremitical* and *Monaſticall* life, *Pennances*, *Pilgrimages*, &c. which they eſteem, and practice,

as *ſpeciall worſhips* of God, and are by the reformed Churches, ſtiled juſtly *Superſtitious.*

Ridiculous ceremonies turn it into evill: willworſhip, *Sect.* 25.

§. 9. 3. When men inſtitute any *rites* or *ceremonies*, for the *ſervice* of God, which are ridiculous (as the *Baalites* did) or unbeſeeming the *ſimplicity* of Goſpell-worſhip; This is no better, than *Superſtition*, and a taking of Gods *Name* in vain. The *Church* of *Rome* can afford us good ſtore of theſe. Theſe, though they be not *Worſhips* invented by men, yet are *Additions* to the worſhip commanded by God, and ſo an *Exceſſe* in Religion, and juſtly branded as *Superſtition.*

§. 10. 4. When men put *Holineſſe* upon things, which God hath not *ſanctified* by their own conſecration; as in *Daies*, *Churches*, *Veſtments*, &c. *Jeroboam* was deeply guilty of this *Superſtition.* Firſt in conſecrating *Chappells* and *Prieſts*, for his Golden *Calves*, in *Dan*, and *Bethel*, and then in conſecrating an Holy Day, and Annuall Feaſt, unto his Gods, "*like unto the Feaſt in* Judah "(*of Gods appointment*) *the month which* "*he had deviſed of his own heart*: 2 King. "12.9.32,33. or as the word is, created, בָּרָא An ordinary *miſdevotion*, in the Church of *Rome*, and in ſome of late amongſt our ſelves: Though the Doctor *grudge* to grant it the name of *Superſtition*, as we ſhall hear at *Sect.* 50.

§. 11.

§. 11. 5. The placing of *perfection* in an high degree, in ſome *ſtates* and conditions of life which God never placed in them. As in that *ſtore houſe of ſuperſtition*, the Church of *Rome*, in voluntary *Poverty*, *Virginity*, *Celibate* and *voluntary* Martyrdome, when God doth not command, or call unto them. And this laſt of *Martyrdome*, the Doctor ſeemes to make the *higheſt degree* of *perfection*, in his Tract of *VVillworſhip. Sect.* 44. For either he muſt mean it of *voluntary Martyrdome*, when a man *ambitious* of it, ſhall ruſh into it, (as many in the primitive times did) without a call from God, and then it is ſo farre from an higher degree of *perfection*, that, in the judgements of the beſt *Divines*, it deſerves not the name of *Martyrdome*: Or elſe he muſt intend it of *Martyrdome*, when God calls a man to ſuffer, and then it is a *duty*, (or at moſt, but a *priviledge*) rather than any *ſtate* of perfection.

§. 12. 6. When men think by their owne, *uncommanded worſhip*, and ſervices of God, either to *merit* pardon of their ſinnes, againſt other Commandements; as ſhee *Pro.* 7. 14. *&c.* "*I have peace offerings with me, this* "*day have I paid my vowes*, which were free willing offerings, as not commanded; "*Come* "*let us take our fill of love*, &c. *q. d.* though I have runne into debt, by my former whoredomes, I have now *ſatisfied* God with

*free-*

*freewill-offerings*, and have quit the ſcore. Or to *purchaſe* Glory, at leaſt a greater *degree* of Glory for themſelves, and to *ſupererogate* for others, by doing *ſomething not commanded*, as *Papiſts* plainly do. How near the Doctor comes to this kind of *Superſtition*, we ſhall ſhew anon, *Willworſhip*, Sect. 50. *&c.*

§. 13. 7. When men place *more pleaſing* of God, and expect more *Acceptation* from God, for *ſervices* or *worſhip* uncommanded, than for thoſe cõmanded by God. The *Apoſtle* intimates ſome ſuch conceit in men, 1 *Cor.* 8. 8. when he ſaies, "*meats commend us not to* "*God; for neither if we eat, are we the better* "*(in our ſelves, or better accepted with God)* "*neither if we eate not, are we the worſe (or* "*are leſſe, and leſſe accepted with God)* yet ſuch as abſtained from ſome meats, had ſuch thoughts of themſelves. And this ſhall be manifeſted to be the *opinion* and *expectation* of the Doctor, for his *voluntary worſhip* (worſhip not commanded by God) to be better *pleaſing*, and to find better *Acceptance* from God: Tract of *Willworſhip. Sect.* 16. 19. and here *Sect.* 52.

§. 14. 8. Laſtly (to adde no more) the placing of more *virtue* and *efficacie*, in things, than either *Nature*, or the *Inſtitution* of God hath placed in them: This is acknowledged to be an *Exceſſe*, and ſo *Superſtition* by the

the Doctor, *ſect.* 45. "*The placing of more* "*virtue in ſome things, than either Natu-* "*rally, or by the rule of Gods word, or in the* "*eſtimation of purer ages of the Church may* "*be thought to belong to them, is guilty of a* "*Nimiety.* His inſtances given, are very pertinent and conſiderable. "1. *Placing virtue* "*or force in the ſigne of the* Croſſe, which is done, not onely by *Papiſts* in croſſing themſelves to *ſcare* away the Divell, but alſo by many *ignorant*, and *ill-taught* Proteſtants, who require *croſſing* of their Children in Baptiſm, as thinking them not *well baptized*, without. "2. The womens *parvula evange-* "*lia.* 3. *opus operatum*, the common *Superſtition* of all naturall men, and Hypocrites. Concerning which, his judgement is good. "*The doing of which, is either groundleſſe,* "*and then it is folly: or elſe it faſtens ſome* "*promiſe on Chriſt, which he hath not made* "*in the Goſpell*, &c. But why he ſhould add, "*In the eſtimation of the purer ages of the* "*Church*, I do not well underſtand, but ſhall conſider in its place. See infra. ſect. 34.

§. 15. Having thus made way for our debate with the Doctor, by ſhewing the *Nature* of *Superſtition*; we ſhall now enter the *liſts*, and conſider what he ſaies about it. And to *his firſt Section*, wee ſay: It may be true, "*that ſome may unjuſtly be charged with the* "*crime of Superſtition, by ignorant or mali-* Sect. 1.

*cious*

*cious defamers of others best actions.* But it is as true, that some that think themselves "*assured in conscience that they are farre enough from the guilt of it*, may justly be charged with it. Commonly those that are most *Superstitious*, are most *confident* of their Innocency, and piety; Many of the *Romish Proselytes*, doe think they are farre enough from this *crime*, in their *highest will-worships*, and rather to deserve *Commendation* from men, and more *Acceptation* from God, than *blame* from any. And no marvaile, if they understand *Superstition*, in the same sense, that the Doctor does, in this *discourse*. That is,

Sect. 2. §. 16. "*Superstition in latine, is most* "*clearly, superstitum cultus, the worship of* "*some, departed from this world, supposed* "*to have life in another.* Sect. 2. That the *Heathens* so defined it, is true, and that the *worshiping* of such then, and by *Papists* now, is one *kind* of *Superstition*, we have already granted; as being the *Worshiping of Creatures*, with, and besides the *Creator*, which is Idolatry against the first Commandement. But the Doctor will not say, (I think) that this is the *onely superstition* to be found in the World, either then, or now. For he grants *δεισιδαιμονία*, an *Excessive fear* of the Deity, to have been another kind of *Superstition* amongst the *Heathens*; and other kinds also among

So the Dr: in sect. 3.

among *Chriſtians*, as wee ſhall heare anon. Some there are (and they no *mean* ones) that derive it from *ſuper*, and *ſto*, or *ſtatuo*, as *ſupra ſtatutum*, ſome *worſhip* inſtituted by men, above the ſtatute law of God; But wee rather reſt in the definition of the *Schoolman*; "*Superſtition is a vice contrary to Religion*, "*in the exceſſe*; which may extend to the other Commandements, whereas this *limits* it to the ſecond.

§. 17. The *Greek* word for *Superſtition*, δεισιδαιμονία; though it ſeems to come nearer the Doctors ſenſe, of *ſuperſtitum cultus*, yet the *Etymology* of the word, does not import ſo much; but rather a *ſlaviſh fear of a Deity*, by imagining it, *Cruell*, Tyrannicall, *&c.* as the Doctors words, "*dreading the Gods, as* "*ſo many Tyrants*, ſect. 13. *a cowardly trem-* "*bling fear; a care & fear of evill ſpirits*, ſect. 9. For though the latter part of the word ſignifies *dæmons*, or Spirits departed, yet the former part does not ſignifie *worſhip*, but *fear*: not that *fear*, which in Scripture, is often put for the *whole worſhip* of God, but a *ſlaviſh* fear of that God whom they worſhip; whereupon they (not knowing, or not contented with *preſcribed* worſhip) deviſe ſome *way* of worſhip of their owne heads, to *pleaſe* and *propitiate* their God; which may well be called *Superſtition*, or *willworſhip*; the one againſt the *firſt*, the other againſt the *ſecond* Commandement. For fear of vengeance: as ſect. 24.

§. 18.

§. 18. The Doctor from the 4. *Sect.* to the 10. having delivered the many *senses* of the word δεισιδαιμων; he saies, "δεισιδαιμονία *referres* "*to the three first*, Poeticall *Gods*, *Angells*, "*or Dead-men, or indeed any thing*, *but the* "*one Supreme God.* This clears what I said before, that this *word* and *worship* is rather *Idolatry* against the first Commandement, which forbids the worship of *any* God but the one *true God*, or any others with him, which is *Polytheism*, than that kind of *Superstition*, which is the giving of *false*, that is *uncommanded* worship, to the true God, against the second Commandement.

§. 19. But he adds, *Sect.* 11. "*When* "Paul *tells the Athenians*, Act. 17.22. *they* "*were* δεισιδαιμονέστεροι, *hee meanes they wor-* "*shiped more Gods or Dæmons than the Ro-* "*mans, &c. or were more devout, more pious,* "*in their worships than any others.* If (say I) they were so called, because they worshiped *more Gods*, then they were *Polytheists* against the first Commandement; If, because they were *more devout* or pious (*impious* rather) in worshiping the true God ignorantly, in a false manner, then their sinne was against the second Commandement; and in both it was *Superstition*, in severall kinds.

§. 20. What *Festus* meant by δεισιδαιμονία, *Act.* 25. 19. is not much materiall; its like he spake it with *scorn* enough, not of

*Pauls*

*Pauls* onely (as the Doctor seems to limit it) but of the *whole Jewish* Religion; (for so the words may import, and are so translated by ours.) But to make the latter part of the verse, to expound the former; "*of one Iesus* "*that was dead, putting him under the vul-* "*gar notion of a δαίμων, or dead Heros,* "*and so meaning the worship of him by δει-* "*σιδαιμονία*, is, I doubt, a strain of the Doctors *Criticisme*; compounding things, which are in the Text distinct. For *Festus* saies, "*they had many questions, both concerning* "*their own Religion* (*Superstition*) *and also,* "*concerning one Iesus, which was dead,* "*whom* Paul *affirmed to be alive*, but not a word there, of *worship* of him, as a *δαίμων*, or *Heros*: which may the better be beleeved, because hee was accused of questions of their Law. *cap* 23. 29. περὶ νόμου ἀυτῶν, and *chap.* 24. where *Tertullus* laies in his charge against *Paul*, there is not one word of this, but other grievous crimes, *Sedition*, *Seducement*, profanation of the Temple, *&c.* v. 5. 6. But the Doctor having taken *liberty* (as oft he delights to doe) to vary from the *common Translation* of ἴδιας, *their*, rendring it by (*his*) and of δεισιδαιμονίας, reading *Religion*, to qualifie, at least, *Superstition*; he goes on to make his *Comment* sutable; that "*Pauls Religion was, in worshiping of Iesus* "*as a δαίμων, or dead* Heros: Whereas Sect. 12.

"*Paul*

"*Paul affirmed him to be alive*, not in *part*, as those departed *Demons* were supposed; but in the whole man, as *raised* from the dead.

§. 21. What *Epicurus* Doctrine was, or what *Heathens* thought of the word δεισιδαιμονία, wee are not much Sollicitous; The Doctor having shewed a great deale of *Reading* and *Learning*, for many sections together, from the 14. to the 27. to little purpose, except to *cloud* the businesse now in hand, to lead us away, in a *mist* of his owne making, from the true and proper *sense* of the word, amongst *Christians*. Yet it seemes the Heathens did often take the word in an *ill sense*, & branded *Religions* which they did not like, by that name. *Plutarch* taxes the Jewes for their *Superstition*, in two things remarkable: 1. "*That they were tyed by their Su-*
"*perstition, as with a net; that when they were*
"*invaded, they would not rise from their*
*seates, on their Sabbath day*, which was an *Excesse* against the fourth Commandement, and grosse *Superstition*. For *necessity* was priviledged to break the *Sabbaths* Rest. 2.
"*Their killing and sacrificing their Chil-*
"*dren to* Moloch, which being a *horrid su-*
*perstition*, was (as the former) intended as a *worship* of the true God, and yet was interpreted no better, than sacrificing to Divells, *Psal.* 106. 37. as all Idolatry was by the A-

Sect. 17, 18, 19.

postle.

poſtle 1. *Cor.* 10. 12. which though in other reſpects, it was againſt the firſt Commandement, *groſſe Idolatry*, ſo in making it a *worſhip* of the true God, (when "*hee* "*commanded it not, neither came it into* "*his heart, as ſomewhere he ſaies*) it was a kind of *Superſtition*, againſt the ſecond Commandement. And in a word, the *Etymologiſt* ſpeakes fully our ſenſe. "*The word* "*among the Heathens is taken for a good* "*thing, but among Chriſtians for impiety.* Sect. 23. cited by the Doctor.

§. 22. From that large *diſcourſe* about the word, at laſt, *Sect.* 27. the Doctor comes to apply it to his purpoſe, and to diſcover three *inconſequences*, in our *cuſtomary* uſe of the word, *Superſtition*. "*Firſt* Sect. 27. "*that it is inconſequent, that Superſtition* "*ſimply and abſtractly taken, ſhould be re-* "*ſolved in all Authors, to ſignifie ſomewhat* "*which is evill, that ſince particularly,* | *which is falſe worſhip.* But, (with his favour) this is not the queſtion between us; but, whither in the *Scripture*, and Orthodox *Divines*, commenting upon that word, it doe not alwaies ſignifie ſomething evill, and particularly, *exceſſive* and *falſe worſhip*. What the *Etymologiſt* thought of it, as the common opinion of *Chriſtians*, wee newly heard: And this is the more pro-

*Vulg. ſuperſtitiones Act.* 17. 22.

bable, becauſe even moſt of the *Popiſh Commentators* doe take the word in an *ill ſenſe*, and render δεισιδαιμονία, by *Superſtition*; without any pretence of a *good* ſenſe of it; which, no doubt, they would be glad to hear, to colour, and cover their own *Will-worſhip*, and Superſtition. The Doctors reaſons for his opinion, have been conſidered afore, but briefly now again; "1. *Thoſe* "*that uſe the word, to expreſſe their owne* "*worſhip, conceive it to be a creditable* "*word, or elſe would not call it by that* "*name.* No doubt, but *Heathens* did think well of their own worſhip: But it being a *falſe worſhip*, it was never the better for that. And it is obſervable, that in all the Doctors former large diſcourſe, hee brings onely *Heathens*, to ſhew the meaning of the word (bad enough ſometimes) but not one *Divine*, Greek or Latine *Father*, or any Moderne writer, *Papiſt*, or other, who take it in a good ſenſe; which was not, I believe for want of good will, but ſomething elſe. 2. His next reaſon is "*when* "*Saint* Pauls *Religion was called by that* "*name*, Act. 25. 19. *it appeares not that* "Feſtus *did uſe that word as an accuſation,* "*or in an ill ſenſe, but in generall to ſigni-* "*fie* Pauls *Religion*, &c. Something hath been ſaid to this above, *Sect.* 20. and now

*See Quer. of divorce. Sect.* 58. Blaming this in another.

we adde, It appears rather to ſignifie ſomething *ill*, in his opinion; For *Feſtus* was not a man of ſo much *Religion*, or had any ſuch *eſteem* of the Jewiſh Religion, as to give it any credit; and therefore ſpake of it, as of a *Superſtition*, as men uſe to call all, not of their own Religion, by way of *defamation*, as the Doctor ſaies, *Sect.* 24. 3. The third reaſon is, "*Saint* Paul *himſelf*, "Act. 17. 23. *ſaith of the Athenians, they* "*did worſhip the true God though ignorant-*"*ly taking him for a* δαίμων. And is not *worſhiping* of the true God, *ignorantly*, with their own *deviſed* worſhip, a *Superſtition* juſtly to be condemned? was it not groſſe *Idolatry*, and ſinfull *Superſtition* in the Iſraelites, to worſhip the *true God*, in the *Golden Calfe*? 4. "*He calls them* δεισι-"δαιμονεστέρους, *more Religious than other men,* "*not in relation to any vitious rite, but to their* "*worſhiping the unknown God, which wor-*"*ſhiped others not.* But this, as it begges the queſtion, ſo is it againſt the text it ſelfe. "*I perceive that in all things you are too* "*Superſtitious*, both in their worſhiping of ſo many falſe Gods, (δεισιδαίμονα) and a God in their ignorant worſhip of the true God, and in their vitious rites of worſhip. And this ſenſe, the Doctor himſelfe gave, *Sect.* 11. "*I conſider and behold you*

*Superſtition* was made matter and reproach to the Romans. *ſect.* 22.

Than other men, is the Doctors gloſs; it may as well ſignifie, more than is meet, and thats too Religious in the exceſſe.

"*in all things* (*or in all that I see in you*) "*as men more superstitious than others*, though the word imports, *too Superstitious, too Religious*; which is a *Nimiety* or *Excesse* in *Religion*, and so justly called *Superstition*, in an ill sense, unlesse the Doctor thinke, that to worship *many false Gods*, and to worship the *true God* ignorantly, be worthy the name of true *Religion*, which the Apostle there censures, by the name of *Idolatry*, ver. 16. "*Hee saw* "*the City* κατείδωλον, *given to Idolatry*, *or* "*full of Idolls*. And the *vulgar* rendring the word, ver. 22. by *Superstitiosiores*, *too Superstitious*, cannot intend it in a good sense; yea the Doctor *Sect.* 31. grants that *Superstitiosus* in the Positive, signifies Excesse more then in the Comparative.

*Sect.* 28. §. 23. The second *Inconsequence* (hee saies) is this: "*That the use of Ceremonies*, "*or rites in the worship of God*, *if not* "*distinctly prescribed*, *either by the exam-* "*ple or precept of Christ*, *should be called* "*Superstition*, *and for that condemned*. But I beleeve, this is a mistake; None that I know, make such a consequence; but rather thus: That what *rite* or *ceremony* soever, is made a *part of worship*, without such example or precept of Scripture, is *Superstitious*, and therefore condemned.

§. 24.

§. 24. The third inconſequence, is a worſe miſtake, "*That men on pretence, and in the* "*name of Piety, ſhould abſtain from ſome* "*obſervances (indifferent) as Superſtitions,* "*either becauſe commanded by lawfull au-* "*thority, or abuſed by Papiſts.* For the firſt *charge*, I beleeve hee cannot give an inſtance of any one underſtanding *Chriſtian*, that ever did abſtaine from obſervance *indifferent*, becauſe commanded by lawfull authority? but rather becauſe they were thought not indifferent, but obtruded on them as *parts of worſhip*. For the other, that they have been uſed by *Papiſts*, is not all, but that by them they have been abuſed, and accounted *parts of worſhip*, and may eaſily return to be ſo *accounted* by others. Sect. 29.

§. 25. We acknowledge this aſſertion, that "*Superſtition may, and doth in ſome authen-* "*tick writers, ſacred eſpecially, ſignifie a* "*Nimiety, or Exceſs in Religion.* What ſaies he to it? Firſt he confeſſes "*Superſtitioſus* "*may denote ſuch exceſs, but ſo alſo doth* "Religioſus, *but then* Superſtition *denotes it* "*no more, than* Religio. Agreed, for *Religion* it ſelf is ſometimes taken for *Superſtition*, when it is applyed to a falſe Religion: And all ſuch *Exceſſe* in worſhip not preſcribed, is a *Nimiety*, and culpable, what ever *A. Gellius* dreamed, as an ill Judge of Superſtition. Sect. 30. 31. *A. Gellius.* Sect. 32

Sect. 32. §. 26. If so used by some Authors, yet hee can say much against it, as 1. "*That some,* "*not of the meanest antient Heathens did it,* "*on the ground of Epicurean Divinity.* Wee professe we regard not, what the best of *Heathens* say in matter of worship, who never knew, what true worship of God meant. 2. "*For Christian writers, the use of a word in* "*that sense, is so slight and casuall, that not* "*sufficient to fasten an ill character upon it,* &c. It is no slight or *casuall* thing, as hee makes it; for all *Divines* that speake of this matter, do generally condemn it, as a thing of ill name and fame, even *Papists* themselves: and its proved by this *Topick*, by most of them, because it is an *Excess* in Religion, and illegitimate worship. 3. "*That those that* "*come home to the point, are so few and mo-* "*dern, and of so small authority, that scarce* "*worth producing,* with *slighting* and *skorne* enough spoken; But why then doth not the Doctor in all this discourse give us the *names* of those many, *Antient, Authentick Fathers,* &c. that take it in a good sense? Hee uses not to be so *sparing*, where he hath such plenty of Authorities. 4. The last is something nearer the question; which supposing it to be taken in an *ill sense*, for excesse, *&c.* saies, "*Then it must be reduced to these two* "*sorts, as consisting either in the degree, or in* "*the number of Actions, in quality or quan-*

*tity*

"*tity*, wee conſider what hee ſaies to both.

§. 27. "*First, in the first kind, hee denies* Sect. 33.
"*there is any ſuch exceſs; There is no poſſi-*
"*bility of being Religious in too high a de-*
"*gree, praying too fervently, too often*, &c.
But what ſaies hee to the arguments of the *Aquin.* 22.
great *Schoolman*, who proves *Superſtition* to 9. 92. *a.* 1.
be an *exceſs* in Religion? and withall ſhewes how he meanes it. "*Not becauſe Superſtiti-*
"*on does yeeld more to divine worſhip, than*
"*true Religion; but becauſe it exhibites Di-*
"*vine worſhip, either to whom it ought not,*
"*or in that manner it ought not.* We ſay (as afore) in *preſcribed* worſhip, there can be no *Exceſs* of degree: The want of the *higheſt degree* there is a *Defect*; A man cannot pray *too earneſtly* (what ever he may doe *too often*) for that is *naturall* and *preſcribed* worſhip: But if a man ſhall tender to God, *deviſed worſhip*, the leaſt degree here is too much: As for *too often* praying, the *Euchitæ* were injuſtly condemned, if this was not a *fault*: Yes (ſaies he) "*their fault was not their*
"*exceſſive practice, but the laying that obli-*
"*gation upon themſelves and others.* And why not both theſe? For God having preſcribed all men *Callings* to be waited on; hee that ſhall pray continually to the *Interruption* thereof, ſinnes as well, as he that prayes not at all. But (ſaies hee) "*the fault is the*

"*neglect of the duties of our calling, not the* "*excesse of devotion.* We say the neglect of their Duties, is caused by the *Excess* of this constant, *uncommanded* Devotion: and so one sin is the cause of another. As for their laying it on themselves or others as an *obligation*, its true, thats a fault; but suppose they had layd no such *obligation*, but only thought it a matter of *greater perfection*, more *pleasing*, and *acceptable* to God; had not this been *Superstition* also? His supposition of "*separating that Excess, from these* "*neglects or omissions, and then it would not* "*be criminous, to pray continually*, is not *feisable* in this life; unlesse hee could find a man, that had no *Calling* to labour in. If any man might have been allowed to pray or serve God *continually*, *Adam* in innocencie might have been the man; and yet he was set to a calling, to *dress* the Garden. "*That the* "*frequency of prayer could not be Superstiti-* "*ous, unless the worship and institution it self* "*were Superstitious*, which he collects from Saint *Austin*, shall give us a double inference; First that an institution of worship (by men) may be Superstitious: 2. That hee seemes to contradict himself; For in worship *commanded*, as prayer is, a man may be *Superstitious*, if he pray constantly, and neglect his calling; which latter he cannot but doe, if he doe the former.

§. 28.

§. 28. If the *Exceſs* be in the *extenſion*, as taking in too many *rites* and *ceremonies*, into the ſervice of God, when he ſaies; 1. "*By* Sect. 34.
"*this it is granted, the rites and ceremonies*
"*themſelves are not ſuperſtitious, but onely*
"*the multitude.* But firſt, we ſhall ſay, that multitudes of rites and ceremonies, are prejudiciall to the *ſimplicity* of Goſpell worſhip, and therefore either are, or will be quickly *Superſtitious.* 2. Wee ſay further, that *rites* and *ceremonies*, be they never ſo few, if introduced as *parts of worſhip*, are *Superſtitious*, and willworhip: as certainly in the *old Law*, the leaſt *rite* and *ceremony* preſcribed by God, was a *part of worſhip*, whither they were *ſignificant* or not: and ſo they would be now, if any ſuch be found *preſcribed*: but if made *parts of worſhip* by men, they were *Superſtitious*; as will not be denyed of many *rites* in the *Church* of *Rome*. 3. Though ſome *rites* and *ceremonies* muſt neceſſarily be in *Religion*, yet they are ſuch as pertain to *Order* and *Decencie*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 40. which yet are not left to the *wit* and *will* of man, to appoint what, and as many as ſhall ſeeme *decent* or *orderly* to them; but are determined *partly* by the generall *precepts* of God; partly by the nature of the things themſelves, & partly by *circumſtances* which occaſionally offer themſelves; and are rather called *circumſtances* of *worſhip*, as *time*, *place*, *geſture*, which are com-

mon *adjuncts* of Religious and civill affaires, (instanced by himselfe) than properly Religious, in ecclesiasticall *rites* and *ceremonies*; much lesse to be accounted *parts* of worship,

§. 29. Our *Divines*, though they doe allow some *rites* or ceremonies, (or rather
Sect. 35. *circumstances*) in worship, such as before; yet they do condemn *significant Ceremonies*, in the Church of *Rome*; unlesse they be such, as either Christ hath appointed, as in the *Sacraments*, or such as *naturally* signifie such a thing; or such as the *Scripture* gives instances of; as *lifting* up the hand in taking an *Oath*; or the *Eyes* to Heaven in prayer, *&c.*

§. 30. Of this kind, are those three sorts of significant ceremonies specified by him;
Sect. 36. "1. *When it naturally signifies the thing, or* "*floweth from it, as lifting up the eyes to* "*Heaven, signifies zeale.* 2. *When custome* "*hath made it significative, as kneeling sig-* "*nifies humility.* 3. *When it is set to signi-* "*fie something else, either matter of doctrine,* "*as standing between* Easter *and* Whitsun-"tide *to signifie the Resurrection, or matter* "*of fact*, &c. These and such like, as they have degenerated into *Superstition*, so in themselves, they are not any *parts* of worship; which they would be, if taught or practised as *necessary*, or making the observers *more Religious* than others, or more *acceptable*

*ceptable* to God, *&c.* But their *significant ceremonies* are *Superstitions*, when neither in their *nature*, nor by any *instituted* of God, they are instituted by men to *signifie* some grace to be procured from God, in the *use* of such *ceremonies*: of which sort the Church of *Rome* hath many.

§. 31. But herein the Doctor is again mistaken, that he saies, "*The sole reason why* "*the old Jewish ceremonies are interdicted us* Sect. 36: "*Christians, is, because the observing of* "*those who foreshewed Christ, and teaching* "*the necessity of them, would be the denying* "*of Christ to be come.* This indeed, was our *reason*, but not the sole one; just such an answer *Bellarmine* gives to an argument from *Christian liberty* against imposition of *new Ceremonies* by men: "*Christ (saies he)* "*would have us free from old ceremonies* "*of* Moses, *because they were figures of the* Cham. Tom: 3. l. 15. c. "*new Testament, and so to cease when the* 16. sect. "*thing is come: But it followes not, we must* 8, 9. "*have no ecclesiasticall Ceremonies or lawes,* "*because we have not those.* To which the learned *Chamier* replyes: "*There was ano-* "*ther cause of abrogation of those ceremonies* "(*though* Bellarmine *conceald it*) viz. *be-* "*cause they did load the Conscience, with a* "*yoake of multitude of Ceremonies: and this* "*is common to those, and to the Traditions of* "*men.* But we say further, 1. The *false A-*

*postles*

*postles* did acknowledge Christ *come* in the flesh, joyning *Circumcision*, &c. with him; and yet are blamed for observing of them: 2. Or was it the teaching of them onely as necessary, that procured their blame? Nor that onely, but for putting the *yoke* of them, upon the Disciples necks, when Christ had taken it off, *Act.* 15. *Gal.* 5. 1 *&c.* 3. Unlesse *observing* of them, and *teaching* them as necessary, be one and the same thing, here are two causes of their interdiction to *Christians*: And if so, then I ask, whether, if he had observed some Jewish *Ceremonie* which did not *foreshew* Christ to come, (some such there were) but *significant* onely of some things past, (though they had not taught it necessarie) the *Apostle* would not have blamed them for that, as *Superstitious*? or had they *devised* any new *rites* and ceremonies, *&c.* would not the Apostle have blamed them for that also, as *too Superstitious*?

§. 32. But the Doctor gives his vote, to the old Rule; "*Ceremonies must be few and* "*wholesome*: Few, for many reasons, which we approve as good. But then at last, in a manner grants, they may be many, "*if they* "*be wholsome, not onely negatively, as harm-* "*lesse, but positively as tending to edificati-* "*on, and then little reason to accuse them of* "*excesse: for then more probably help devoti-* "*on, then encumber it.* But this is to unvote the

Sect. 38. 39.

the old Rule in part: For if they be *Salubrious*, wholſome, no matter how many they be: yea, "*if but negatively as harmeleſſe*, which is a dore wide enough to let in moſt of the *Romiſh* Superſtitions; what harme is there in many of them? good *innocent Ceremonies*, as ſome have called them: But if poſitively for *edification* (as all *willworſhipers* thinke of their own inventions) is that a plea to beare men out, in the multitude of *Ceremonies*, added to the worſhip of God? And ſuppoſe them *few* and *wholſome*, in the judgement of men; if they be impoſed as *parts of worſhip*, or *efficacious* to procure grace, or *Acceptance* from God; are they not too many, be they never ſo *few*, and thought never ſo *wholſome*? Laſtly, who ſhall be the *Phyſitian* to judge of their number and ſalubrity? not *every private man*, to be ſure, *Sect.* 55, 56. "*he is not allowed to be a competent judge*, of *indecency* in them, much leſſe of the number or *wholeſomeneſſe* of them. Who then? the *higher powers*, Sect. 55. whether *Eccleſiaſticall* or *Civil*, he expreſſes not; But if men, or any *number* of men, may be competent *Judges* in the *worſhip* of God, will not the *Wiſdome* and wit of man *expatiate* here, and grow wanton? One *man* or *Church*, thinks, this is very wholſome, for *edification* and devotion; another as *wiſe* as he, will adde another, till the Church have a *yoake* put upon her neck, as heavie

heavie, or heavier than the *Iewes*. Who knowes not the multitude of *wholsome Ceremonies* of *Rome*, came in at this door.

§.33. This question of *a competent Iudge* in such matters, is the matter to be resolved, because the Doctor makes so many *distinctions* about these *wholsome Ceremonies*, that vulgar wits are not capable of them: Sect. 42. "*You distinguish of such Acts, wherein that excesse is supposed to be: that they are either ordinable, fit, or proper to that end, the service of God, or inordinable, unfit,* &c. What ordinary man (who yet hath a Conscience to be satisfied in the worship of God) is capable of these distinctions? Hee confesses "*there are great store inordinable, unfit, unproper, of these in the Church of* Rome? Yet *they* are not of the Doctors *opinion*; but think them all, both fit and necessary. But yet he hath a *salve* for such. "*In this case, though any one may be a Nimiety, and that a fault, yet still this not the fault of Superstition; but rather of folly and vanity,* &c. And I pray what is *Superstition*, but *folly* and *vanity*, in the worship of God? Are not *Idols* and all false worship called *vanities*, and folly? "*many such like things ye doe*; Mar. 7, 8, 9. *full well ye reject the Commandement of God, that ye may keep your own Tradition*: "*In vain do they worship me.* Let the Doctor shew his dislike of such, as he will, yet if *men*

may

may be *Iudges*, what are fit for number and *wholeſomneſs*, every after-comer will thinke himſelfe *as wiſe*, as he that went before, till they have loaded the *Chriſtian* above the Jew. Beſides, as the learned *Chamier* well obſerves; there may be many miſchiefes in a few, if the *Authority* to inſtitute them be in the *Church*, or any man, or men: cc *For ſup-* cc *poſe they be but few now, yet we muſt conſi-* cc *der, how many they may be hereafter; ſeeing* cc *the Authority is given to every ſucceeding* cc *Church or Pope, to conſtitute ceremonies or* cc *eccleſiaſticall lawes, as they ſhall think fit;* cc *and ſo the yoake never certain, but alwaies* cc *growing; as experience tells us*: To paſſe this: if *Superſtition* be ſo named, becauſe it is *Super ſtatutum*, above the *Statute Law* of worſhip; or becauſe it is an *Exceſs* of ſervices added to the worſhip of God; certainly theſe *unfit, improper Ceremonies* may well be deemed ſuch, and the Doctor need not *grudge* the child the name of *Superſtition*. As for thoſe that charge ſuch *trifles*, (they are to the Doctor, belike, but *trifles*) cc *with the* cc *title of* Superſtition, *and then extend it to* cc *thoſe things which have no ſuch fault, and* cc *ſo run the circle*. Let them for me, ſee how to get out. I onely ſtill ſay, what ever deſerves the name of *Superſtition*, is a Nimiety and *Exceſs* in Religion; and what ever is an *Exceſs* in Religion, is *Superſtition*: Let's hear wherein the Doctor is pleaſed to place it. §. 34. Sect. 43.

Sect. 45. §. 34. "*The placing of more virtue in ſome* "*things, than either naturally, or by the rule* "*of the word, or in the eſtimation of purer a-* "*ges of the Church, may be thought to be-* "*long to them: as in the croſſe,* &c. We ſpake ſomething in generall to this, but now wee

Sect. 14. ſhall aſſume, of all thoſe *Ceremonies* of the Church of *Rome*, *unfit*, *improper*, &c. and of all *ſuperadded parts* of worſhip what ever; They do place *more virtue* in them, than either *naturally*, or by the *rule* of the word belongs to them; *ergo* they are Superſtitious. The *Aſſumption* I prove thus: They place in them *virtue* to *pleaſe* God by them, to procure more *acceptance* from God, and his *bleſſing* upon them; which neither naturally, nor by the *rule* of the word, the *inſtitution* of God, they have in them: *ergo.* more might be added, but I forbear.

But what meanes the Doctor to adde, to his diſjunction, "*or in the eſtimation of pu-* "*rer ages of the Church?* Had the *purer* ages of the Church (after the *Apoſtles*) any power to put *virtue* into things, which they had not, either *naturally*, or by the *Rule* of Gods word? If he denies this, the *addition* was ſuperfluous: If he affirm it, hee *begges* the queſtion; For we ſay, the *pureſt Church* hath no *Authority* in matters of Religion, to put *virtue* or *efficacie* into them, but God onely, in Nature, or by his inſtitution, in the word:

word: Or if any, the *Pureſt Church*, ſhall take upon her to doe it, I ſhall make bold to adde the Doctors words, in part. "*The doing* "*of ſuch, is either groundleſſe, and then it is* "*folly*; *or elſe it faſtens ſome promiſe on* "*Chriſt, which he hath not made in the Goſ-* "*pell.* And what is that but a *lye*, and an *Addition* to the word: a *Nimiety*, or exceſſe of Religion, as he calls it, that is, *ſinfull Superſtition*, and that would impure the pureſt *Church*.

§. 35. The *Nimiety* muſt be "*an exceſſe* "*of fear, or being afraid of God, when wee* "*need not; as thinking our ſelves bound, when* "*God neither commands, nor forbids; ab-* "*ſteining religiouſly*, &c. Wee take what hee grants, this is one kind of *Superſtition*, (as we noted above in ſtating of the queſtion, at *Sect.* 7.) but not the *onely*; there are many more. And I like the Doctors reaſon well, here; "*becauſe ſuch a man addes to the Com-* "*mands of Chriſt* (*as the former to the pro-* "*miſes*) *annexed to the Chriſtian Religion,* "*thoſe things which belong not to it, and ſo* "*is an exceeder in the fear and ſervice of* "*God*, &c. And this is *Superſtition*. Sect 47. And this he confeſſes "*is a culpable and cri-* "*minous exceſſe, not in doing what God com-* "*mands not* (*for that may be innocent e-* "*nough*) *but in affirming God to command* "*or forbid, what he doth not*, &c. True; in

things left indifferent and free by God, hee is not guilty of this kind of Superſtition; if he doe them, or abſtain. But yet he may, of another kind: that is, if he place more virtue in them, (in doing or abſtaining) than either naturally or by the rule of the word, is due to them, (as he ſaid before.) But in matter of worſhip it is not ſo; For there, it is a *Nimiety* and exceſſe, to doe what God hath not commanded, as wee have often ſaid.

§. 36. When as he concludes, "*That this* "*way of dogmatizing; or impoſing as ne-* "*ceſſary ſuch things as the Law of Chriſt* "*hath not made neceſſary, is the ſpeciall and* "*onely kind of Superſtition, which he be-* "*leeves, any kind of Proteſtants to be guilty* "*of*; it is a great miſtake. For 1. he granted another kind. *Sect.* 45. "*In placing more* "*virtue in things, than naturally, or by the* "*rule of the word, belongs to them.* 2. All *Willworſhip* deviſed by men, and added as *parts* of Gods worſhip, hath been proved to be an *Exceſs* in Religion, and ſo *Superſtition*; beſides the reſt, which we have noted above. As for his addition, "*of obſerving* "*ominous, inauſpicious events, unluckie* "*daies*, &c. they fall under his firſt *kind* of Superſtition, *Sect.* 45. Placing and putting more *Virtue* in them than God in *Nature*, or by his *Inſtitution* hath put into them. Which though they be not properly *Exceſſes* of the Chriſti-

Sect. 47: 48.

Chriſtian Religion, (being common to *Heathens*, and not properly *worſhip*) yet are they *Exceſſes* in Chriſtians, that uſe them, and a kind of *Superſtition*, call it *Religious*, or *Civill*, as he pleaſes.

§. 37. And now wee are come to another conſideration, of the laſt *way*, that he ſuppoſes, may be called *Superſtition*; and that is, "*Becauſe men place* holineſſe *in ſome obſervances, amongſt us, which* (*what ever* Seſſ. 49
"*may be ſaid of it in* theſi) *in* hypotheſi *or application to the particular caſes, is generally very falſe, or impertinent.* Wee ſhall conſider what he ſaies for it.

§. 38. 1. He askes, "*what is meant by holineſſe? reall inherent holineſs, or onely ſeperation from common uſes?* The latter onely, we would anſwer: *Separation to holy*, from common uſes: that is, ſuch a *ſeparation* to holy uſes, that the things may no more be *alienated* to common uſes: this is *proper* holineſs.

§. 39. But then the onely inquiry will be, "*By whom, and how farre any thing, is thus ſeparated; either by* [1] *Chriſt*, or [2] *the Apoſtles, or the* [3] *univerſall Church, in pureſt ages, or the* [4] *particular Church* (*and rulers thereof*) *wherein we live, or* [5] *if free, by our own Act.* He tells us here, by *whom* the *ſeperation* is made, but not a word, *how far*, or in what difference, a thing *ſeperated*, by the ſeverall *Authors*, is Seſſ. 51.

made holy, or whither it be *equall* in all. That a thing made *holy*, by a *private* perſon, is equally holy with that, done by a particular *Church*; and ſo upwards, that of the *generall Church*, equally with that of the *Apoſtles*, and that of the Apoſtles equall with that of *Chriſt* himſelf: this would firſt have been reſolved. Hee ſeemes to make the difference of the *Holineſs*, from their ſeverall *Seperations*, to be onely *graduall*; but wee ſuppoſe it to be *ſpecificall*, at leaſt, betweene the *Seperation* of God or Chriſt, and that of the *Church* (to ſay nothing yet of the *Apoſtles*.) And withall, wee ſay, we deſire a proofe, that any but *God*, or *Chriſt*, or his *Apoſtles* guided by his *Spirit*, can make any thing *properly Holy*: Now to make a thing *properly holy*, is not, to ſeperate it onely to *holy uſes* from common, (as the Doctor defines it. *Sect.* 50.) but to make it, 1. a *part* of worſhip, 2. to be *efficatious* to work and convey *holineſs*, to him that rightly uſes it: 3. to make the ſervice & perſon, *more accepted*. 4. To give a ground of *expectation* of a *Bleſſing*, upon ſome *promiſe* thereof. in the word, *&c*. In this ſenſe none but God alone, can *Sanctifie* and Seperate any thing, to *Holy*, from common *uſes*. All which the Doctor either takes no notice of, or takes as granted, *others* may doe. For he ſaies, "*The way to diſcern, whither we exceed*

(*that*

cc (*that is, be Superſtitious*) *in any of thoſe*
cc *afore, and place more holineſs than is due to*
cc *them, is to account them holy, in a degree*
cc *proportioned to the authority of him that ſe-*
cc *perated them.* Wee ſhall ſpeake ſomething conſiderable to this. For 1. The difference between *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles, and the reſt is not well, or not diſtinctly laid out: For the *Apoſtles* authority was alſo *Divine*, by Chriſts commiſſion. 2. Then it followes, that the Authority of the *Apoſtles*, in their *Seperation*, differed much from that of the *Univerſall Church*, & the reſt, as much as *Divine* & humane. 3. The precept or example of the *Univerſal Church* (as it cannot be demonſtrated ever to have concurred, in making any thing *holy*, there never having been an *Oecumenicall Councill*, truly ſo called, ſo) cannot make any thing *properly holy*, with the reſpects afore ſaid; but onely *improperly*, with reſpect to *holy things* or *duties*, ſo made by God: *e. g.* In *times* or *places* ſeperated, by God or men; there is this difference (beſides thoſe above) that *Time* or *Place*, ſanctified by God, require *holy duties*, to till them up. But ſeperated by men, they are to wait upon *Holy duties.* In the firſt, the duties are appointed for the *Time*, or *Places* ſake: In the other, the time or place, are appointed for the *Duties* ſake: but this is to make *any Time*, or any *Place*, when and where

thoſe *duties* are performed, as *holy* as all other times or places, that is, the one no more *Holy* than another. We therefore deny, that either the *Univerſall Church*, or any *particular* Church, or any *private* man, can make any thing *properly Holy*: which the Doctor doth not at all undertake to prove. Onely thus he goes on; "*If that which is thus ſe-*"*perated, be by Chriſt himſelf, I ſhall count* "*it holy in that degree, and my ſelfe obliged* "*by virtue of Divine precept, and ſo of the* "*reſt; and then I offend not.* But 1. I ſuppoſe the Doctor will account himſelfe obliged to an Apoſtolicall inſtitution, by Divine precept alſo: I had thought Apoſtolicall * and Divine, had been both one with the Doctor; but I perceive he makes them differ, and yet differences *Apoſtolicall* from *Eccleſiaſticall*; as if the *Apoſtles* were neither *Divine*, nor *Humane*; but ſomething between both. 2. By this diſtinction of his, the *Papiſts* may excuſe their *groſſeſt Superſtition*, in placing *Holineſſe*, in things, times, places, &c. by borrowing the Doctors anſwer; "*They may* "*ſay, they account them holy, but either by* "*the authority of the generall, or particular* "*Church of* Rome, and that is no *Superſtition*, ſaies he, ſay they.

* Hee thought and ſaid ſo, in his firſt Quere, *ſect.* 22.

The Apoſtles Doctrines and inſtitutions, are ſo owned by Chriſt himſelfe, that what is truly Apoſtolicall, is immediately and by neceſſary conſequence, divine and infallible *Sect.* 52.

§. 40.

§. 40. But he goes on, cc *If my voluntary* cc *oblation, I perform as a voluntary oblation,* cc *and onely expect that God that hath promi-* cc *ſed to accept ſuch, will accept it; all this* cc *while I am not blameworthy.* But 1. what meanes he by his *voluntary* oblation? If his *willingneſs* in tendering *commanded* worſhip, he cannot doe that *worſhip* aright, without reſpect to the command: If *voluntary worship* of his own, without a command, he hath no *promiſe* of acceptance, and ſo can expect none. Yea, he may rather *expect*, or fear puniſhment, threatned in the 2d. Commandement, to ſuch *worſhip*. 2. The Dr. may remember, that *Sect.* 45. he blamed that for *Superſtition*, cc *when* cc *virtue is placed in ſome things, which na-* cc *turally, or by the rule of the word, does not* cc *belong to them*, and gives the reaſon *Sect.* 46. cc *becauſe that addes to the promiſes of* cc *the Goſpell, and faſtens a promiſe on Chriſt* cc *which he hath not made.* Now how will hee free himſelfe from *Superſtition*, in his *voluntary oblation*, that is, his *uncommanded worſhip*, unleſſe hee can ſhew a *promiſe* in the Goſpell, for ſuch acceptance. For naturally there is no ſuch *Virtue* in a Willworſhip; and *Inſtitution* hee cannot plead; for that were a *Contradiction*; *viderit ipſe*. But hee ſaies ſtill; cc *In caſe of reſolution, and vow,* cc *adde that reſpect in my performance, which* cc *is due to ſuch, and I am not blameworthy.*

If hee meane, that his *reſolution* and *vow*, makes his *voluntary oblation* more *accepted*; he addes to his *Superſtition*, to ſecond *Will-worſhip* with a vow, and ſo *profanes* his vow, as well as the worſhip of God. If he meane, that his vow is a further *degree* of worſhip; what will hee anſwer to the *Papiſts*, who make *vowes* of *ſingle* life, and *povertie*, &c. to be a *ſpeciall worſhip* of God; which he rejects. If he ſay, their *Vowes* are of things unlawfull, but mine of things lawfull: I grant this difference, but then ſay, that in making thoſe vowes, or *things vowed* to be *parts* of the worſhip of God, they both agree; and both are *Superſtitious*.

Sect. 53. §. 41. It is not then "*the ſtraining of theſe* "*any degree above their ranke, as elevating* "*an eccleſiaſticall conſtitution into a Divine* "*precept*, &c. That onely makes him faulty, and that *perhaps* (ſaies he) *capable of the title of Superſtition.* For if either the *Church* or he, place *divine worſhip*, *acceptance* (more acceptance becauſe not commanded) or more *perfection*, *&c.* in ſuch performances, it is, and will be *Superſtition* ſtill what ever they think. Beſides, in *deviſed* worſhip, it is not enough to free from guilt of *Superſtition*, to ſay or think, I account this or that holy, onely by the *Authority* of the *Church*, and not of *Chriſt*; For whoſoever is the *Author* of ſuch *Holineſſe*, he places

places more in it, than God *allowes*, and ſo muſt needs be *Superſtitious.*

§. 42. *Obj. Papiſts* and other *Superſtitious* perſons have don ſo, and ſo the thing is Superſtitious, and muſt be forborn, *Sol.* 1. "*The* Sect. 54.
"*ill uſe of a thing will not corrupt a thing*
"*commanded or an innocent thing.* True, but we ſuppoſe your *voluntary oblation*, not to be a thing *commanded*, but to be a thing *forbidden*, as all *Willworſhip* is: and therefore to be forborn. 2. He ſaies, "*there is nothing to*
"*oblige me to abſtain, from that, which they*
"*have Superſtitiouſly uſed, unleſſe danger*
"*of being thought Superſtitious as they, or*
"*making others be ſo; which is not*
"*Superſtition, but ſcandall.* To be thought *Superſtitious*, when I may avoid it, is a wrong to my *credit*; to cauſe others to be ſo, is a wrong to their *Soules*: But theſe are not *conſequent* of that we ſpeake of, that is, of *Willworſhip*, which is one of the worſt kinds of *Superſtition*; tendering that to God, *as worſhip*, which he commanded not.

§. 43. And now the Doctor may be pleaſed to *review*, and if he will *recall*, his bitter, falſe, uncharitable concluſion, *Sect.* 57, 58. unbeſeeming both his piety and gravity; For now it will appear (and ſhall doe more hereafter) that the charge of *Superſtition* upon ſome men, is no *Mormo*, nor yet unjuſt; but what is *avowed* by himſelf and party, to be their

their *opinion* and *practice*; and what is proved to be really *Superſtitions*, according to the true Notion of the word *Superſtition*, amongſt Reformed Orthodox Divines: which if it be not ſufficiently yet manifeſted, ſhall more fully be made good, in the following Exercitation of Willworſhip.

# EXERCITATION THE SECOND, OF *WILL-WORSHIP.* WITH *DOCTOR HAMOND,* BY *D. C.*

---

Math. 15. 8, 9.

*This people draweth nigh unto me, with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.*

*But in vain do they worship me, teaching for Doctrines, the commandments of men,*

*Augustin. de consens. Evang. lib. 1. c, 18.*

*Deum sic colere oportet, quomodo ipse se colendum præcepit.*

---

*London* Printed for *John Wright* at the signe of the *Kings Head* in the Old Bayley.

# OF WILL-WORSHIP.

Section 1.

HAD the *Reverend and learned Doctor* ( as it became him ) diſtinguiſhed the words; either ἐθελοθρησκεία in Greek, or *Will-worſhip* in Engliſh, before he began his *Defence* of them; wee ſhould better have been able, to *judge* of his Diſcourſe about them. For the words, in both languages, may be taken in a *double* ſenſe. 1. For *Voluntary, Spontaneous*, or willing worſhip, that is *willingneſſe* and freeneſſe, in *worſhip* commanded by God; and then they were too *blame*, that put an *ill* notion upon them. Or 2. For *worſhip* deviſed by the *wit*, and appointed by the *will* of man, as contradiſtinguiſhed, to the *wiſdome*, and *will* of God; and then it was not ſo much the *ill-Fortune* ( as he calls it ) as the juſt *puniſhment* of them, "*to* "*paſſe under an ill notion, and to be taken* "*for ſomewhat reproveable, as well in* "*a Chriſtian, as in an Heathen.* For the ſumme and ſcope of the ſecond Commandement, in the *Affirmative* part, being this. "*God muſt be worſhiped with his owne* "*preſcribed worſhip*, and in the *Negative* part.

*Auguſt. de conſenſ. Evang. l. 1. c. 18.*

part, "*to forbid all deviſed worſhip of God,* "*by the wit, or will of man.* The very name of *will* (of man) put to *worſhip* of God, as oppoſed to the *will* of God, the onely *Rule* of worſhip, is as a *brand* in the forehead of it, to *characterize* it, as condemnable in all.

This is acknowledged by the Doctor: God is to be worſhipt in a manner peculiar to him, & appointed by him. *Apend.* on 2d. Commandement.

§. 2. How oft, or ſeldome the *Greek* word is uſed in other *Authors*, or the *Tranſlators* of the old Teſtament, wee ſhall not trouble our ſelves to enquire; when the thing ſignified by it, (in the ſecond ſenſe above, in which ſenſe the *Reverend Doctor* doth and muſt take it, or he hath *no Adverſarie*,) that is, "*deviſed and impoſed worſhip, by the will* "*of man,* is ſo much *decryed*, and declaimed againſt, in *Scripture*, as an high *Indignity* and affront, to the *Divine* Majeſty. This is ſomething, little to the credit of it; That the ſimple word θρησκεία, and the verb θρησκεύω, are but twice a peice, uſed in the booke of *wiſdom*, and alwaies in an *ill* notion: 2. That ἐθελοθρησκεία it ſelf, being but once uſed in the New Teſtament: it is, (by the judgement of moſt *Interpreters*, Proteſtant and Popiſh) taken in an *ill* notion, as ſhall appeare hereafter.

§. 3. What the word ἐθελοθρησκεία, in the place, *Col.* 2. 23. ſignifieth, may indeed be gathered from the *Contents*: But the Reverend

rend Doctor, ſeemes *too ſhort*, in laying of it out: "*The Apoſtles diſcourſe in that* "*place, is* (*ſaies he*) *of* δόγματα, *Doctrines* "*of men, teaching ſome things to be forbidden* "*by God, that he forbiddeth not.* This is in part true; ſome *falſe teachers* might impoſe ſome Doctrines upon their brethren, as Gods *Commands*, when they were not, as being now *outdated* by Chriſt; but the *ſcop* of the Apoſtle is, to diſpute, in this Chapter, againſt the *corruptions* that were creeping in, in their *Chriſtian worſhip*; which was the uſe and end of thoſe Doctrines; and to ſtabliſh the *Coloſſians* againſt them: Which that it may appear, let us *review* the context, from the 4. verſe downwards. Thus he begins: "*This I ſay, that no man ſhould begnile you,* "*with enticing words.* In the *Greek*, they are more ſignificant; μὴ τὶς ὑμᾶς παραλογίζηται, ἐν πιθανολογίᾳ: Put upon you Sophiſticall Paralogiſmes; *probabilitate ſermonis*, by probable arguments, as *Beza*; by *Rhetoricall inſinuations*, or *ſophiſticall ſubtleties*, as *D. Davenant*, explaines it, to lead you away from Chriſt. Now the Apoſtle goes on, to diſcover ſome of thoſe *toiles*, and waies, whereby *Seducers* did beguile their followers. 1. *Philoſophicall ſpeculations*, having a ſhew of much wiſdome; *ver.* 8. "*Beware leaſt any man* "*ſpoil you through Philoſophie*; an inſtance whereof is given in the 18. *ver.* "*in voluntary*

*Bez. in locus.*

*In locum.* The word Philoſophy ſeems to me to be all one, with worſhiping of Angels, v. 18. ſaies the Doctor; Superſtition. *Sect.* 7.

"ry *humilitie*, *and worſhiping of Angells.* 2. *Traditions* and *Inventions* of men, ſuperadded, or continued in the *worſhip* of God; an inſtance wherof is in the 20.22. *ver.* "*Why are* "*yee ſubject to Ordinances, after the Comman-*"*dements, & Doctrines of men*? 3. Moſaical Ceremonies, revived, after they were abrogated by Chriſt: of which he ſpeakes, *ver.* 16. 17, His ſcope in all, is to diſpute "*againſt all* "*rites and Ceremonies, obtruded upon the* "*Church, as parts of Divine worſhip, a ne-* D. Daven
"*ceſſary duties of holineſs, and righteouſneſs* in locum.
"*and as binding Conſcience.* As that learned and judicious *Profeſſor*, expreſſes it. And the *Apoſtle* oppoſes this onely againſt them, *ver.* 8. "*They are not after Chriſt*, but *invented* and impoſed by men; *Not after Chriſt, i. e.* not after the *Doctrine*, or Commandement of Chriſt, in the Goſpell; which he expreſſes in another phraſe, *ver.* 19. "*Not* "*holding the head*, but "*after the Comman-*"*dements, and Doctrines of men*, ver. 22. Whence it appeares, that the *Reverend Doctor* ſeemes miſtaken, when hee ſaies; "*Where yet you muſt obſerve, he doth not* "*ſpeake of Commands, but Doctrines*, i. e. "*not of the prohibition of the Magiſtrate*, "&c. *but of falſe teachers, impoſing them as* "*the commands of God.* For the Apoſtle ſpeakes expreſſly, theſe impoſitions, *Touch not, taſt not*, &c. "*were after the Commande-*

"*ments*,

"*ments, and Doctrines of men,* ver. 22. and ver. 8. "*after the Traditions of men*, to *worship* God, by the observation of them: The worship of God, did once consist in these *observations*, and *Abstinencies*; and the *false Teachers* put them upon their followers, as still usefull to this end: Having done this, hee sets an ill *Character* upon those *Doctrines of worship*; "*which things have indeed a shew* "*of wisdom, in Willworship*, &c. But are "*after the Commandements and Doctrines* "*of men*, not any *Doctrines* or Commands of *Christ*: and so no better, than *Willworship*, &c, The Doctor seemes to place the illnesse of this practice in this; "*That they urging* "*some abolisht ceremonies as still in force by* "*divine precept, should thereby deny Christ* "*to be come in the flesh.* Which though it bee true in part, yet is not all that the Apostle here intended: but this he also addes, that they, *placing the worship* of God, in those *observances*, not after *Christ*, but after the *Commandements* and traditions of men, did fall into *Willworship*; which had a *shew of wisdome*, but no more. For it is not onely (sinfull) *Willworship*, to *teach* and observe the Old *Ceremonies* as parts of Gods worship, when they are abolished; but also to *invent* a new way of worship (as that of *worshiping Angells* was for certain *ver.* 18.) and to put it upon God, as an *acceptable* worship.

§. 4.

§. 4. That wee have not miſtaken the Doctors meaning, will appear by that which he addes, about "*the difference betwixt ma-*"*king of poſitive humane Lawes, in indiffe-*"*rent things, and urging or teaching things*"*for Divine commands, which either never*"*were commanded by God, or elſe are now*"*outdated by Chriſt: The Apoſtles diſcourſe*"*proceeds of the latter*, &c. This is true, the Apoſtle hath here no *reflection* on the *Magiſtrates* making lawes, in indifferent things: but yet, if the *Magiſtrate*, or *Church* ſhould invent and impoſe any *new way* of worſhiping God (as the *Church* of *Rome*, hath done many) would not the *Apoſtles* arguing conclude them to be *Will-worſhip*, as well as if they had urged and taught ſome *antiquated* ceremonies to be obſerved, as a *part* of the worſhip of God The Doctor grants and aſſerts, "*That if the Magiſtrate* Sect. 3.
"*ſhould teach or impoſe Doctrines of men*,
"*upon others, as the Commands of God when*
"*they are not, he ſhould thereby incurre the*
"*cenſure of a falſe teacher alſo*; And if he ſhould *teach* or impoſe *ſome antiquated wor-ſhip*, upon his people, though not as the command of God, would he not be a Teacher of *falſe worſhip* alſo? As for his inſtance of *David*, who appointed the *Levites* to ſerve from the age of 20. years, whereas God by *Moſes* had appointed it, but from 25.

years old &c. It is first *Impertinent*, for hee brings it as an instance of a *Magistrates* power in a thing indifferent, whereas this was in a *matter* of *Religion*, and more then so, in a matter formerly *Commanded* by God; wherein, what he did, is not imitable by any *Magistrate* now: who hath no power to *order* any thing in *Religion*, against a former *Order* of God, as in the case in hand, there was. What then may be said, for *Davids* altering the appointment of God (as in some other things besides? *Divines* do answer, that *David* was a *Prophet*, inspired by God, or directed by some other Prophet, how to *Order* the affaires of the Temple, and *worship* of God. And this to mee is evident, by texts of Scripture. 1 *Chron.* 28. 19. "*All this* (*said* "David) *the Lord made me to understand* "*in writing, by his good hand upon me, even* "*all the works of this pattern*, which hee ascribes to the *Spirit* of God, *ver.* 12, 13. & *cap.* 23. 27. "*by the last words of* David, *the* "*Levites were numbred from* 20 *years old*, of "which he saies, "*the spirit of the Lord spake* "*by me*, 2 Sam. 23. 2, 3. But this by the way.

§. 5. The full importance of the words, *ver.* 22. (hee saies) is this; "*That when* "*those abstinencies are imposed and taught*, "*as divine obliging precepts, this is an abuse* "*of them* (*which were otherwise innocent* "*things*) *and that abuse of them dangerous*

*or*

cc *or deſtructive.* But 1. why doth he refuſe our *Tranſlation* of thoſe word, cc *which all* cc *are to periſh with the uſing?* For the verb, from whence ἀποχρησις, is derived, ſignifies ſometimes, ſimply, to uſe. And the Civill Lawyers take *Abuſus*, for the conſuming uſe, ordinarily: 2. Whither the *Apoſtle* ſpeaks of the *meats*, or of thoſe ordinances of *abſtaining*, both may be ſaid to *periſh* in the uſing: The meates apparently, and the *Ordinances* themſelves, in this ſenſe, that whereas whilſt they were under Gods command, they were *profitable* to the obſervers; now being *outdated*, they periſh with the uſing, without any *ſpirituall* advantage. 3. There is little or nothing in the text, to import, that they were *impoſed* and taught by the *Falſe Treachers*, as Divine obliging *precepts* (though if ſo, that had beene an *abuſe* of them) but rather that they were the *Commandements* and *Doctrines of men*; as the next words following are: and herein the Doctor places the *danger*, *Sect.* 6. as we ſhall ſee. Juſt as that Doctrine, *ver.* 18. concerning *worſhiping of Angels*, in a *voluntary humility*, &c. was the *Doctrine*, or command of a man cc *vainly puft up in his fleſhly mind*, but could not be *pretended*, much leſſe *impoſed* as a *Divine* command. So the Doctrines and *Traditions* of the *Phariſees*, were not pleaded to be the *Commandements* of God, but ex-

*Eſtius in locum.*

expresly called the *Commandements of men*, Math. 15. 9. and oppoſed to the *Commandements* of God, *ver.* 3. 6. And in this Chapter, *ver.* 8. Thoſe *Doctrines* are called the *Traditions* of men, and *rudiments* of the World. 4. I would ask the Doctor, whither the placing of the *worſhip* of God, in *obſervation* of thoſe Ordinances of *Abſtinence*, though not *taught* nor impoſed as Gods Commands, upon a mans ſelfe, or others, were not an *abuſe* of them, and being a *ſelf-deviſed* Willworſhip, were not εἰς φθορὰν. as *deſtructive*, as the urging them ſtill as Gods Commands? His great miſtake is, that this was the *onely abuſe* of them, and that "*otherwiſe they were innocent things*, for ſo he ſayes: which now he may ſee, they were not. And laſtly the following words *ver.* 23. ſeem to imply, the abuſe to have beene, not that they *impoſed* them, as *Divine Commands*, but as *parts* of Divine worſhip (which the word ἐθελοθρησκεία imports) in a pretended *humility*, and not *ſparing* of the body, *&c.* For he ſaies, they have a ſhew of wiſdome, not as the *Commands* of God, but in *Willworſhip*, &c.

§. 6. Yet let us hear, wherein the Doctor, places the *danger* and deſtructiveneſſe of them. "*That they were after the Commandements, and Doctrines of men; which words* "*point out that, wherin the danger doth con-*

"*ſiſt*

"*fist, to wit, imposing on men humane Ordi-*
"*nances or Doctrines.* Stay there a while: Then (say I) they did not impose them as *Commands* of God; nor did the *danger* lye in that; But I desire to know, *what* it was that they *imposed*, by those *Ordinances* and Doctrines? was it not, a *way of worshiping* God by those *Abstinencies, touch not*, &c. I think the *Doctor* will not deny it: For it is not to be meant of imposing of *Humane Ordinances*, about *indifferent* things, by the *Magistrate*; he hath *cautioned* against that, *Sect.* 3. & 4. but of *Teachers*, imposing them as Ordinances of *worship*, in Religion: and therein the *danger* did consist; because they imposed on men, *humane* Ordinances and Doctrines, to *worship* God by. The Doctors glosse of his own former words will now prove his *own*, that is, *singular*, when he addes "i. e. *those things which though* "*they were not commanded by God, are yet* "*by men affirmed, pretended and taught,* "*(though without proof) to be so comman-*"*ded.* The *danger* and destructiveness rather consisted in this, that they were but the *Commandements* and Doctrines of men, *placing* the *worship* of God, in those *observances*, which either he *never Commanded*, or were now *outdated.*

The abstinences they teach *Sect.* 7.

§. 7. And now we are come to the 23. Verse; which the Doctor makes to be, "*A descrip-*

"*tion of the doctrines themſelves, or the ab-*
"*ſtinences they teach, abſtracted from all ſuch*
"*accidental abuſe.* But this may prove a miſ-
take; for the words rather contain a *deſcripti-*
*on* of the reaſon of that *danger* and de-
ſtructiveneſſe, in them: *viz.* becauſe they
were no other, no better than *Willworſhip*,
with a fair pretence of *Wiſdome*, becauſe the
*Worſhip* of God, was lately placed in them:
and they carry a great pretenſion of *Humili-*
*ty*, and *Selfdeniall*, in abſtaining from things
*pleaſing* to the body, which they thought no
doubt, would be *pleaſing* unto God, and an
*acceptable* ſervice. The words indeed may be
variouſly rendered by *Interpreters*, but
without any great *difficulty* or difference.
For the moſt part, they agree in the *ſenſe*,
though they differ in words. And I beleeve
the Doctors *Interpretation* of it, is *ſingular*,
without any precedent, either *Antient*, or
*Modern*, *Proteſtant*, or *Papiſt*. Thus he pa-
raphraſeth the words. "*Which things have*
"*ſome true, at leaſt appearing notion of wiſ-*
"*dom in them* (*wiſdom in Scripture ſignifying*
"*piety*) i. e. *have either ſome reall matter*
"*of piety in them* (*for ſo* λόγον *ſignifies*) *and*
"*this would be more clear, if we ſhould read,*
"ἅ τινα *in two words, thus, which things*
"*have ſomewhat of piety in them, or being*
"*conſidered in ſome reſpect, have piety in*
"*them, or as the Fathers rather underſtood it,*

"*ſome*

"*ſome colour, ſome appearance of piety, to*
"*wit, in voluntary worſhip and humility,* &c.
But this is a ſtrange *Liberty*, in *Interpreting* ſcripture, not onely that it waves the Interpretation of all our own *Tranſlaters*, of all the *Antients*, and even of *Papiſts* themſelves for the moſt part (whom this gloſſe would much *pleaſe*) but alſo that he doth not bring his *mind* to the Scripture, but ſtraines the *Scripture* to ſpeak his ſenſe and meaning. To examine it a little. 1. That λόγος here ſignifies, ſome reall matter (what ever it doth elſewhere) is *gratis dictum*, and againſt the *ſtream* of Interpreters: Some render it *Imaginem*, as *Jerome*; ſome *ſpeciem*, ſome *pretextum*: And the *Greek Fathers*, oppoſe againſt it, *truth* and *power*: what is it then, but a *ſhew* or appearance? 2. That hee renders σοφίας, by *piety*, is as ſtrange, in this place, (however in theſe *Proverbs*, and elſewhere, it may ſignifie ſo) when moſt interpret it 1. by *Wiſdome*: that is, "*a ſhew of ſome excel-*
"*lent doctrine, rather brought from Heaven,*
"*than found out by men.* Which to be the ſenſe here, is moſt probable upon theſe grounds. Firſt from the *context*, ver. 8. the Apoſtle calls it *Philoſophy*, and *ver.* 18. hee ſaies) the *Worſhiper* of Angels, "*was puffed*
"*up in his fleſhly mind*, that is, in a *carnall*
"*conceit* of his own *wiſdom*, in finding out that *way* of worſhip: For *Superſtition* and

*D. Daven in locum.*

*Vid. Irenæum lib. 3. c. 2.*

*Willworſhip* ever pretends to *Wiſdom*, to bee *wiſer* than God, in preſcribing his *worſhip*: and this makes it ſo *dangerous* and *deſtructive*, that men ſet *their wiſdom* againſt, and above Gods; Secondly it may very well be *parallell*, to that place, 1 *Cor.* 2. 4, 5, 6. where the *Wiſdom* of God, and men are ſo flatly oppoſed, in *preaching* of the Goſpell. "*Not with entiſing words of mans wiſdom*; "*but in the demonſtration of the ſpirit and* "*power: the wiſdom of God*, &c. And this *pretext* of wiſdom in *Willworſhip* ariſes from a double ground, 1. From the *fraud* of Impoſtors, who alwaies boaſt, that their *Traditions* proceed from the *Spirit* of *wiſdom*; as the *Phariſees*, and *Montanus* did: 2. From the *carnall minds* of *Superſtitious men*, who are much *pleaſed* to ſeek for *righteouſneſſe* and *ſalvation*, and to put *holineſſe* in externall rites and exerciſes; as that learned *profeſſor*, on the place, hath well obſerved. 3. To aſſert that thoſe things (thoſe *Abſtinences*, as a *worſhip* of God) have ſomewhat of *true* and *reall* wiſdome or piety in them, is a plain *begging* of the queſtion, now between us. For we ſay, (as allmoſt all *Interpreters* doe) they have onely a *ſhew* of wiſdome, but no *truth*, nor reality, and that the *Apoſtle* condemnes them as *Willworſhip*, which yet the Doctor onely denies, by *aſſerting* the contrary, but proves not. 4. what

*pre-*

*preſumption* is this, to read the words aſunder, ἃ τινὰ, for ἅτινα, contrary to all *Greeke* copies, and *Latine* Interpreters, onely to make out his own gloſſe? And yet let him take his choice, and read as he pleaſe; it will not advantage him at all; for ſtill it comes but to this, "*which things have* τινὰ λόγον, "*ſome* ſhew *of wiſdom, or piety*, not *ſomewhat* of wiſdome, much leſſe ſome *true* reall matter of wiſdome in them. The *Apoſtles* ſcope being (as we think, and hee muſt not *begge* the contrary) not to hold out *ſomewhat* of wiſdome or piety in them, but rather of folly and *impiety*, as we ſhall ſhew hereafter. Laſtly, (as to this Section) he leaves out the particle μὲν, *quidem*, which is an *extenuating* particle: "*They have indeed a ſhew* "*of wiſdome, but not the truth*: Or they have indeed a *ſhew* of wiſdome, but in *Willworſhip* and *Willhumility*, &c. It's true, *Interpreters* differ about the placing of the *Adverſative* δὲ. Some underſtand it to be *underſtood* before Willworſhip, as afore; ſome at thoſe words οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ: they have a *ſhew* of wiſdom, but are yet *of no price or worth*. *Herome* thinkes the particle μὲν is redundant, others think ſomething is wanting; thus (after the manner of the *Hebrewes*) which things have a *ſhew* of wiſdome, but *not the truth*. Much like that place 2 *Tim.* 3. 5. "*Having a form of Godlineſs, but de-*

*Eſtius in locum.*

*Beza.*

"*nying*

"nying the power of it. However, the Doctor did not well to conceal this *particle*, and to render ἐθελοθρησκία by *voluntary worship*, having not yet told us, what he meanes by it: of which anon.

§. 8. That the last part of the verse, "*not* "*sparing of the bodie, not in any honour, to* "*the satisfying of the flesh*, is added to shew, "*that there is somewhat of true or preten-*"*ded piety, in those former Doctrines, by the* "*contrariety, to that tending and filling of* "*the flesh, which is so unlike piety*, is another *gloss* like the former, an *assertion* without proof. For the *neglecting*, or *punishing* of the body (as the Doctor phrases it) by *Abstinence* from things allowed by God, they placing the *worship* of God in it, hath indeed a *shew* of pretended wisdome or piety, as preferring the *worship* of God, before the *belly*, or body; but no *truth*, and is equally condemned, as a *Will worship*, by the Apostle; At least, this is the *question*, and must not be begged.

§. 9. Yet this the Doctor doth: For hee takes it as granted, with not a little confidence; "*That this interpretation which he* "*hath given, is the most prompt, proper, and* "*genuine rendring of the verse, that will be* "*met with*, and thereupon inferres, and resolves; "*that there is no ill character set upon* ἐθελοθρησκία or *Willworship*, *by the*

"*the Apoſtle in this place*, which wee ſhall examine, when we have heard, what in his judgement is noted by it, which is this; "*That voluntary Worſhip, or acts of Religi-*"*on, which the Hebrewes call* נדבה *Ne-*"*dabah, the Freewill-offering, which was* "*not required of them, by any obligation of* "*particular law, and yet was not wont to be* "*condemned, or ſuſpected, but accounted as ac-*"*ceptable to God: under which head, the* "*Abſtinences here ſpoken of, may not unfitly* "*be comprehended.* But there is a great miſtake, in comprehending theſe *Abſtinences* under the *Freewill* offerings. For both, the *Freewill offerings* were ſomething *Poſitive*, and theſe *Abſtinences* were *Negative*, rather *not-offering*, than offering, *Touch not*, *taſt not*, &c. and alſo theſe *Abſtinences* were commanded by ſpeciall Lawes, but *Free-will-offerings* (he ſaies) were not required of them, by *obligation* of particular Law: This difference is enough at preſent, wee ſhall ſay more hereafter. And now wee attend his diſcourſe, conſiſting in three things.

§. 10. Firſt (hee ſaies) he will give his reaſons, for his firſt *Aſſertion*, "*That* "ἐθελοθρησκία *is here uſed in a good credita-*"*ble ſenſe*, which he endeavours by 6. Arguments, *Sect.* 11. "*Becauſe Willworſhip,* "*is here joyned with two, not onely lawfull,*

"*but*

"*but laudable Christian virtues.* Before I come to the particulars, I cannot but note in *generall*, that taking the word here, in a *good sense*, the Doctor complies too much with *Papists* (most of them taking it in an ill sense) who use to take off the force of the *Objection* by protestants, from this place, (against their *Willworship*, in their many *Traditions* of worship) by answering that it is taken here in a good sense, and that (as the Doctor does) for *voluntary Religion*, or worship. Which good sense, the very learned and *acute Chamier* professes, he never saw, in any *Interpreter* of the place. Onely he saies, he found *Justinian* the *Jesuite*, distinguishing the word, to signifie (as the simple word, θρησκεία does) sometimes *Superstition* and *Impiety*, and sometimes pious and *religious* worship, *voluntarily* undertaken; but yet, in this text, asserting it to signifie *Superstition*, or as *Ambrose* saith, *counterfeit Religion.* But hee shakes this distinction as *groundlesse*, as we shall hear anon. And now to the Doctors Arguments, to prove it taken in a good sense. First, "*because it is joyned* "*with Humility, which being by* Calvin, "*(a man not much regarded by the Doctor* "*in other things) interpreted in this place,* "*the Reverence both of God and men, is no* "*doubt a Christian virtue, and cannot de-* "*fame the Willworship, to which it is associ-*

Tanstrat. l. 1. c. 6. sect. 5.

"*ated*

"*ated*, &c. But by his favour, *Humility* here, is not that true and laudable *Chriſtian virtue*, but a meer *counterfeit*, a pretended *Humility*, fit for a pretended *Willworship*: For the firſt words, ſignifying onely a *ſhew*, not any reality of wiſdome, exemplifies it, firſt by *Willworship* (which is *affected Religion*, having a *ſhew* of piety, but not the ſubſtance) and then in an affected and counterfeit *Humility*. And the Doctor may remember, the ſame word is uſed in the 18. *ver.* of which he ſaies hereafter, "*it was an impi-*
"*ous kind of Miſtaken Humility*, and why may not this be ſo too? being both alike pretended, in a *Will-worship*, not *commanded* by God, but *invented* and impoſed by men; And ſure ſuch *impious* miſtaken *Humility*, is no *Chriſtian*, or laudable *virtue*: But of that place more anon.

*In affectâ-taque humilitate, quæ affectatæ Religioni conjuncta eſt. Eſtius in locum.*

*Sect.* 23.

2. The next Pretence for his good ſenſe, is, "*Becauſe it is joyned with puniſhing or*
"*not ſparing, or* (*as* Calvin) *mortifying the*
"*body; which as an act of ſelfdenyall, cannot*
"*be acceptable to Chriſt, and as a ſpecies of*
"*of Revenge*, 2 Cor. 11. 7. *Will deſerve to*
"*be numbred among the effects of godly ſor-*
"*row*. But to this we ſay again, there may be ſuch a *puniſhing*, not ſparing, or *mortifying* of the body, and ſelfdenyall, which hath a *ſhew* of wiſdom or piety, but is not onely a counterfeit, but an *impious* miſtaken mortification

*In præpoſtera & in ſolita quidam obſtinentiæ & afflictione corporis.* ibid.

mortification, or ſelfdenyall, *viz.* when this *punishing* of the body, is made a *part of* the worſhip of God. What thinks the Doctor of the *Baalites* launcing and cutting themſelves? What of all the *Romiſh* ridiculous *pennances*, *pilgrimages*, *faſtings*, &c. Does he not juſtifie them, in all their *Wilworships*, and that from this text? have they not a great ſhew of *Wiſdom*, *Piety*, *Devotion*? of *ſelfdenyall*, and mortyfication of the body? are theſe *acceptable* to Chriſt: Are their *ſelfpunishments*, worthy to be numbred with that *Revenge*, or accounted among the *effects* of godly ſorrow? If he ſay, not, I ask, what is it that makes them *impious miſtaken* mortification, *&c.* Hee cannot ſay, becauſe they held thoſe forth as *Commands* of God, for that they deny: then it muſt be, becauſe they make them *worships* of God; *Voluntary worship*, yet that the Doctor, endeavours to juſtifie, by this text. I ſhut up this thus; Theſe two *virtues* (as hee calls them) are there ſo far from juſtifying *Willworship*, to which they are aſſociated, that they fare the *worſe* for it, and are made *unchriſtian*, and *impious* by its company. For though *Humility* and *ſelfdenyall*, in the *commanded* worſhip of God, be excellent *virtues*; yet when they *precede*, or accompany the conſtitution of falſe, that is *deviſed* Willworſhip, nothing is more *impious* and abhominable to God.

§. 12.

§. 12. The ſecond reaſon of his *good* ſenſe, is this, "*Becauſe theſe Doctrines are here* "*ſaid, in reſpect of the VVillworſhip, to have* "λόγον σοφίας, *ſomewhat of wiſdom or piety in* "*them: which ſomevvhat, if reall, then it is* "*paralel to that of* 1 Tim. 4. 8. *bodily ex-* "*erciſe is a little profitable ſtill, or profitable* "*for a little.* Before I adde the reſt, I ſay to this: 1. This *ſomewhat reall matter* of wiſdome, in willworſhip, in the judgement of moſt *Interpreters*, is nothing but a meere *ſhew* and appearance, and indeed *reall folly* and impiety, as was manifeſted on *Sect.* 7. And for the parallel place, the gloſs *corrupts* the text; when he thus expounds it, "*Bodily* "*exerciſe profiteth a little, or for a little.* For the Apoſtle oppoſing *bodily exerciſe*, to Godlineſſe, which is profitable to all things, he means, that ſuch bodily exerciſe, (abſtinence from marriage, and meats) made a *ſervice* or *worſhip* of God, is *profitable* for nothing, or rather (by a μείωσις) is *hurtfull* and abhominable; and ſo is the *VVillvvorſhip* in this place. The Doctor ſeemes to place the *illneſs* of thoſe bodily exerciſes, in this; "*when they are taught as neceſſary, to the* "*defaming of marriage and meats*, he means, I ſuppoſe, *neceſſary*, as commanded by God: But (ſay I) if they taught them (as they did, ſome of them) onely as *Commands* of men, not neceſſary, no defaming marriage, &c,

*&c.* but as an *acceptable* worſhip of God; would the Doctor ſay, they were not *hurtfull*, and abhominable, but *profitable* a little? I think not; or if he doe, he juſtifies ſome *Papiſts*, who make them a *ſpeciall worſhip* of God, not neceſſary, *&c.* But we ſaid afore, the words here ſignifie onely a *ſhew* of wiſdome or piety. Then ſaies hee, the argument will be ſtill of validity, "*For can any thing* "*be ſaid to have ſo much as a ſhew of Wiſdom,* "*in reſpect of VVillworſhip in it, if that Willworſhip paſſe confeſſedly, either for fooliſh, or* "*impious?* Let him aske all *Interpreters*, who render the words, "*a ſhew of VViſdome* "*in Superſtition or affected Religion*, how this can be: But I cannot but wonder at the Doctors queſtion: For cannot a thing have a *ſhew* of wiſdome or piety, which is confeſſedly *foolish* or impious? and if ſo, may it not be ſo in reſpect of the *VVillworship* in it? The *Baalites* launcing and cutting themſelves in their *devotions*, had it not (to them at leaſt) a *ſhew* of piety, and yet that worſhip was confeſſedly *impious*? ſay the like of the Papiſts *whipping themſelves*, and other ridiculousand heatheniſh pennances; have they not to them and others of their ſuperſtition, a great *ſhew* of wiſdome, and piety, and yet to us, are confeſſedly *foolish* and *impious*? Cannot, doth not the doctrine of *Falſe teachers* hold out a *ſhew* of wiſ-

dome

dome and piety, in their worship, and yet to all orthodox known to be *foolish* and impious. Does not on the one side, the *Wisdome* of God in the Gospell, hold out a shew of foolishnesse to naturall wise men, and yet is the *wisdome* and power of God, to salvation? on the other, does not, is not the *wisdom* and piety of Hypocrites and Idolaters, folly and impiety to God. But (saies the Dr.) "*Can any thing be represented to me, as having so much as a shew of piety, in respect of rage or lust discernible in it?* This comparison is ill laid; For rage and lust are for kind confessedly wicked things. But *worship* may be true or false; and so as *true* worship may have a shew of folly to natural men; so may false (and therefore *impious*) worship have a *shew* of wisdome and piety in it, to the same men: And the one, though it have a *shew* of folly, yet may have none in it, but is the *very wisdome* of God: So the other, though it have a *shew* of wisdome or piety in it, yet hath none, but is both *folly* and impiety. Let me put it a little more home to him: May there not be *zeale* (which may be nothing but *rage*, πηρὸς ζῆλος in Saint *James*) which may have a shew of *true* zeale, and yet be nothing but *rage* and madnesse? must I needs "*suppose somewhat really* "*of wisdom or piety, in that passion, or else* "*it cannot have so much as a shew of wis-*

"*dome, or piety?* To conclude may not the *Divell* himſelfe transferre himſelf into (and ſo have a *ſhew* of) an Angell of light? and must I ſuppoſe neceſſarily, that there is *ſomewhat really* of light or piety in him, or elſe cannot hee have ſo much, as a *ſhew* of them?

*Vid. Append.*

To conclude this argument, let the Doctor note it once for all, that the words are not; "*Which things have a ſhew of wiſdom and of* "*Willworſhip, and of Humility and of not* "*ſparing the body.* For then, as *wiſdome* was good, and taken in a *good* ſenſe, ſo might the reſt be taken; and the fault be, that they had onely an *appearance*, not the *truth* or powers but the words are, "*They have a ſhew of* "*wiſdome, in Willworſhip, and in Humility*, &c. And if they were faulty, becauſe they had onely a *ſhew* of wiſdome, they wil bee more faulty, that they had but a *ſhew* of pietty, or worſhip, or Humility. So that, the words, ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ, &c. doe no more enforce us to take it in a good *ſenſe*, than, when we ſay, "*Judas made a ſhew of love to his* "*Maſter, in his traiterous kiſſe; and the Pa-* "*piſts devotion, in bowing to ſtocks and Ima-* "*ges.* In both which ſayings, love in the one, and devotion in the others, are taken in a good ſenſe; but the ones traiterous kiſſe, and others bowing to Images, are not at all taken in any better ſenſe for that ſhew, or appearance

rance of *love* and *devotion*, but are rather so much the *worse*. And this shall suffice for his second reason.

§. 13. "*A third reason is, because the* "*Greek fathers, though they interpret* λόγος "*onely of appearance, as contrary to power* "*and truth, yet they paraphrase Willworship,* "&c, *by words, of Good Savour:* εὐλαβὴς, εὐσεβὴς, &c. First this is well that the Greeke Fathers agree with us (or we with them) in exposition of the first words. a *shew* (not as he, *somewhat* reall) of wisdome, or pietie: Nay they expresly oppose against it, *power* and *truth*: and can that which hath neither *power* nor *truth*, in the worship of God, be taken in a good sense? And do not the Fathers imply as much? *Chrysost.* δοκεῖ μὲν εὐλαβὴς τὶς εἶναι, &c. *in loc.* Hee seemes to be Religious, but is not so. Oecumenius, ὑποκρινόμενον εὐλάβειαν, pretending (as *Hypocrites*) Religion in worship, and is there any goodnesse in Hypocrisie? "*But the in-* "*terpreter of* Clemens Alex. *renders the* "*word, in Religion*: Why? is not *Religion* it self of various senses? The simple word θρησκεία, often signifies *false* Religion, and superstition, as well as true. But the composition, makes it worse, and alters the sense, because it addes the worke of mans *Will* to *Worship*, which is abominable to God: Doe not all Idolaters pretend *wisdom*, in their *Inven-*

*Ps.* 106. 39 We went a whoring with their own inventions.

*ventions*, *Piety* in their *Devotions*? and does not this pretence make it more *odious* to God, as taking upon them to be *wiser* than he, and more *Devout* than he requires? But why did not the Doctor tell us, how the *Latine Fathers*, and other later *Interpreters* render the word? *Ambr. Simulatam Religionem*, *Hierom*, *Superstitionem*, *Theodoret*, (a Greek Father) ἐθελοθρησκεια, *pro eo quod est proprium decretum introducunt, non legis scopum & institutum sequuntur. Vulgar latine* (and all Popish Commentators take it thence) *Superstitionem*, *Salmeron*, *& Estius*, *omnem affectatam & voluntariam Religionem significat, cum quis fingit sibi cultum ex cerebro suo, volens videri Religiosus.* It signifies all affected and voluntary Religion, which a man forges out of his own braine, willing to seem Religious. I spare our owne Divines. In a word, *Estius* gives this interpretation of the words, out of *Augustine* and *Thomas*: "*Which have a shew of wis-*"*dom, not true, but such as is placed in Su-*"*perstition and humility, which is* "*false wisdome.* I leave all to the Doctors consideration.

*In locum.*

§. 14. *The fourth reason, because by this* "*way that very obscure place, may be con-*"*veniently understood, which hath posed so* "*many*: viz. *That such Doctrines are de-*"*structive of Christian Religion in obtrud-*

"*ing*

"ing *humane outdaded judaicall constitutions,*
"*for Divine precepts; as still obliging, and*
"*yet in some respects have piety in them, at*
"*least a shew of it, to wit, in Willworship,*
&c. To which Interpretation of his, enough hath been spoken before, on *Sect.* 7. but we adde. First, for my part, I have not observed amongst Interpreters, any such *difficulty* or obscurity of this text: I dare say, the Doctors exposition makes the *greatest obscurity* that ever I met with: They generally agree in the *sense* of the words, taking them in an *ill sense*; Onely *himselfe* and some *Papists*, *Bellarmin*, and and some others, take them in a good sense.

2. That such Doctrines as he speakes of, are *destructive* to Christian Religion; is true, but not such onely; nor are such onely meant in his text, *viz. outdated Judaicall* constitutions obtruded for *Divine precepts*, still obliging; but all *Humane Institutions* of worship though never known before, are equally *destructive* to Religion; though they pretend not to be *Divine precepts* or prescriptions: The Apostle therefore brands them as *destructive*, because they are but *Willworship*, not because they are *outdated*, or *Judaicall*: And those as well as these, however they may have a *shew* of wisdome and piety, to carnall hearts, yet to understanding Christians, have not in any respect,

*piety* in them, but are vaine and sinfull *Inventions* of men, that is, *Willworship.*

*Vide Append. ad sect* 15.

§. 15. "*A fifth reason, because* Hesichius "*renders the word by* ἐθελοσέβεια *voluntary* "*Worship, the very notion of* נדבה *the* "ἐκούσια, *voluntary gifts or offerings; as* "ἐθελοκωφῶν, *is* ἐθελόντως κωφεύων, &c. That he renders the word so, is no *advantage* to his cause, for the words may both signifie the same thing, *viz. Will-devised* worship, in an *ill* sense. And though it be true, that in *humane* Authors, the *derivatives*, and *compounds* of this word, do expresse the *Freewillingnesse* of the person; as ἐθελοκωφων ἐθελόδουλος, &c. yet that will not help the Doctor, who doth not understand ἐθελοθρησκία with *respect* to the *willingnesse* of the person, in a *commanded* worship of God; but *voluntary Worship*, that is, *Worship* not *Commanded* by God, but offered to him by the *Freewill* of man, as wee shall see anon. And it is as true; that though the word bee taken in other *Authors* for *voluntary* worship, and be but once used in the *Scripture*: yet the spirit of God, the *Master* of all languages, does use words, (whither once or oftner) in a sense clearly *different* from other Authors, (and I think the Doctor makes use somewhere of such a *Criticism*) As for instance, the Greeke word

Any thing else beside what God hath commanded. *Sect.* 16.

word ἐθελοθρησκία in Scripture is taken for a vice, *Eph.* 5. 4. which in *Ariſtotle* is uſed for a virtue. And the word ἐθελοθρησκία, is ſo taken in the *beſt* judgements. Nor is this, the notion of the ἑκούσια, uſed by the 72. for *Freewill-offerings*, voluntary gifts, *&c.* as ſhall appeare in a place more convenient.

§. 16. 6. cc *Reaſon it ſelf aſſures us, that* cc *things done in the ſervice of God, are not* cc *therefore ill, becauſe they are ſpontaneous,* cc *but on the other ſide, when a man ſhall out* cc *of a pious affection doe any thing elſe beſide* cc *what God hath commanded by any particular precept, this action of his, is to be ac-* cc *counted ſo much more commendable and* cc *acceptable to God,* &c. Before wee go any further, we muſt remember the diſtinction of *voluntary* worſhip, which the Doctor confounds; *voluntary* may be applyed to *worſhip* in a double ſenſe; Firſt as it is a a *modus*, or *manner* of worſhip; that is, it is *willingly* performed, and ſo it is *neceſſary*, not arbitrary, attendant upon worſhip: or ſecondly, as *voluntary* implyes the *efficient* cauſe conſtituting the worſhip, *viz.* the *Will* of man, as contradiſtinguiſhed to the *Will* of God. In ſhort, there is a vaſt difference, betweene

*Voluntarium cultum, non mandatum a deo, ſed illi oblatum humana voluntate*, &c. D. Davent *in loc. Deus amat cultorem voluntarium, ſed odit cultum voluntarium.* Ide. *vide plura:*

*voluntary worſhip*, and *Willworſhip*; the one preſuppoſes the *Worſhip* commanded by God, the other *conſtitutes* the worſhip, out of his own brain. Now its true, *Worſhip* of God commanded, is not ill, becauſe it is *ſpontaneous*, that is willingly performed, but ill, if it be not *ſpontaneous* or voluntary; becauſe in all ſervice, God requires the *Will* or heart: But in worſhip *deviſed* by man, the *Will* beares all the blame, and the more *voluntary*, in that ſenſe, the more abhominable: and herein, (contrary to what the Dr. here aſſerts) "*the voluntarineſſe of it, de-*
"*fames the worſhip, it being the causa, the*
"*irregularity of it, and imputable to the*
"*action it ſelfe*; Math. 15. 9. *In vain do they*
"*worſhip me*, &c. Again, when a man out of *pious affection*, ſhall doe any thing *beſide what God hath commanded* (in ſuch *worſhip* as is invented by himſelfe or other men) this action is to be accounted, ſo much more (not *commandable* or *acceptable*, as the Doctor, but) *odious* and *abhominable* to God. But the Doctor addes; "*there being*
"*no univerſall negative in Scripture, prohi-*
"*biting all things and degrees of things, be-*
"*ſides what are in particular commanded.* Yes, we ſay, there is an *univerſall negative prohibition* in the Scripture (beſide ſpeciall ones) in the ſecond *Commandement*, forbidding all things, that is, *all worſhip*, and all

all *degrees* of that worship, besides what are particularly commanded. Hence it followes, that there is no *generall command* or *doctrine* of the Gospell (which is another *caution* of the Doctors) to which such *Willworship* can hold conformity. Nor will it salve the matter, which he brings from an Heathen, or the *Apocrypha*, "*that piety is one of those* "*virtues, which have such a compass, that the* "*larger they be, they are so much more com-* "*mendable, and the more spontaneous, the* "*more acceptable.* For this must be meant onely of *commanded worship*, and the *degrees* or intention, of the *Will* in those services: therein, you cannot exceed the *generall* command, to *love the Lord* (and so to serve him) *with all thy heart and strength*; But in *Willworship*, that is, of mens *owne* devising, the first *step* in it, and least *degree* of it, is far from commendation, or acceptation: because you are so farre from being *obliged* to to doe it, that you are strictly obliged not to do it.

§. 17. We have done with the first undertakiug; wee are coming to his next, to point at the cause of the mistake of the sense of the word; which hee supposes to be.

§. 18. 1. "*That the vulgar Latin renders* "*it* Superstition; *annd* Calvin *and* Jerome "*follow them; whereas the truth is,* Reli-

Religio

"δαιμονία, is the word for Superstition: and "ἐθελοθρησκεία signifies it no more than "θρησκεία, which is used in a good sense. But might not a man say as much for δεισιδαιμονία it self, as the Doctor saies for ἐθελοθρησκεία, and bring the Doctor himself for his *voucher*? Does not hee tell us, in his other Tract, that δεισιδαιμονία sometimes is taken in a good sense. "*For Religion or worship of God* "*without any marke set upon it of true or* "*false, and rendred by Superstition, Religi-* "*on*, &c. It seemes then, δεισιδαιμονία, and *Superstitio* are both taken in a good sense, sometimes for Religion, and in a bad sense other times, and so ἐθελοθρησκεία, and they agree in an ill sense sometimes, and this helps not at all; to vindicate the word.

Of Superstition. Sect. 22.

Secondly, θρησκία it selfe is taken sometimes in an *ill sense*, (as the Doctor knowes) as well as a good; why then may they not both equally signifie *Superstition*? especially when applyed to false or *mendevised* worship.

The worshipers of Angells cannot be freed from the crime of Superstition saies he.

3. *Superstition* or *Will-worship*, is more generall than δεισιδαιμονία, thats but one *species* of *Superstition*, if taken (as the word imports) for *Dæmonum cultus*; But all *false* worship is *Superstition*: and the rather, because it is *Spontaneous*, *voluntary*, that is, *Will-devised* Worship. Lets try the next.

§. 19.

§. 19. "*Another reason is, that among* "*the Jewes, all was to be done according to* "*the pattern in the Mount: so some have* "*resolved, that no rite or circumstance, no* "*degree of worship may be used in the* "*Christian Church, but what hath Christs* "*example or particular precept to authorize* "*it,* &c. But the Doctor much *mistakes* the question himselfe, while hee is labouring to shew others mistakes.

For 1. it is not about a *rite* or *circumstance* or *degree* of worship commanded, (as *Time, Place, Gesture*, not prescribed) but of the *Worship* it self; and herein we say we are *equal* with the Jewes, and all the people of the world; we may not vary from the *prescription* on the mount, in the second Commandement, to *constitute* any *part* of worship; but what wee have the authority of *Christ* for, in the new Testament. And we do say, and that truly, "*that what ever wor-* "*ship is not commanded by Christ, or justi-* "*fied by his example, is censurable under the* "*title of Willworship, though otherwise in* "*respect of the matter of it, it would not* "*be censurable.* And we have for our ground, both the second *Commandement* in the old, and this text (beside others) in the New Testament to justifie our assertion.

2. That saying of the Doctor, "*We may* "*justly conclude those actions justifiable,* "*be-*

"*because not prohibited, and not onely so, but* "*also acceptable and the more acceptable for the voluntarinesse*, &c. is most *unsound*; For in *worship*, it will not justifie a man, that it is not *prohibited* (in particular) but rather, it is condemned, because it is not *commanded*; though all *Will-worship* (in our sense) is *prohibited*, as wee often said. As for his *gloss* upon the words of *Photius*, I say little; I onely note, that he seemes to make it a *fault*, to *sit* at the readding of the Gospell, which the *Ecclesiastical Canons* did not command; and yet makes it *no fault*, to adde a *Will-worship* of a mans own, which θεῖος θεσμὸς, the Divine lawdoth forbid.

§. 20. "*A third ground of the abuse of the* "*word, is the affinity of the* 18 *verse of this* "*Chapter; and so the Will-worship here, is* "*guilty of all the same charges*, &c. The *distance* pretended between them, is so little, that they may easily be reconciled; That respecting a *new* devised worship onely, and this the *reviving* of an *old* & *outdated* worship, as we shall see. I onely observe what *Maimonides* observed, "*That the errour that brought* "*the greatest part of Idolatry into the world,* "*was, that men conceived and taught, that* "*vain worships and superstitions, were the* "*will and pleasure of God*; that is, pleasing and acceptable unto God. This is exemplified aboundantly in the *Church* of *Rome*, that

whose *Superstitions* are grounded upon this, that they are very *pleasing* to God; let the Dr. take heed, he do not justifie, or imitate them.

21. But he goes about to make good this *distance* between the verses; onely he forbears not, to weaken his following proofes by the *Interpretation* of *Clem. Alex.* who compounding these verses, reads thus. "*Let no* "*man beguile you of your reward in VVill-*"*worship of Humility, and in neglecting of the body*, &c. and makes it very *certaine*, that he understood them both as one, and very suspicious, that they are at no such distance, as the Doctor pretends.

§. 22. You must (saies he) observe these two things. 1. "*That the words are not in* "*the Originall* ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ, καὶ ἐθελο-"θρησκεία, but θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ, &c. *Now* "*the word* θέλων *hath with the* 70. *a sense*, "*which antient writers have not taken no-*"*tice of.* viz. *pleasing himselfe in worshiping* "*of Angells, or proud of a feigned humili-*"*ty as* Hierome, &c. But this comes to nothing; for 1. the *sense* is the same, whither the words be joyned, or parted: a *voluntary humility*, as the *ground* of that worship of Angells: They (good men) were so modest and *humble*, they would not *rush* upon God immediately (though he *Command* it; and so it was grosse *pride*, masked with humility) but they would go by *Angells*, as

Medi-

Media tours: Is not this the very plea of *Papists* at this day, for their, *Invocation* of Angells and Saints?

2. Take θελων asunder, and for *pleasing* or *delighting*, or *proud* of a feigned Humility: Did not these *false teachers* do the same? were they not much *pleased*, delighted, proud of this *new-old-revived* worship, as applauding their own wisdome in the *Invention* of this worship, and their *Humility*, and devotion, in their *abstinence* from such meats, &c. Did not *Jeroboam* (think you) much *please* himself, and *pride* himself, in his *politick* Religion of the *Golden Calves*? Are not all *Superstitious* and Idolatrous *worshipers*, delighted with their *VVillworship*, especially the first *Devisers* of it? insulting not over others onely, as more *Religious* then they. "*Lo, I* "*thank thee, I am not as other men*, &c. *I* "*fast twice a weeke*, &c. But also over God himself, as making him beholden to them, by going *beyond* what he commands?

*In iis quæ non vidit* ἐμβατεύων *festuosus incedens.* Eras. in v. 18.

*Qui jussa tantum facit nihil agit non vulgare qui transcendit præcepta, hic Angelus est &c. hic Deum sibi obæratum facit* D. Davent *in loc.*

3. Why may not ἐθελοθρησκία in *Composition*, signifie the same with θελών ἐν θρησκίᾳ, asunder? *self-pleasing worship* or Religion; His *Clemens*, joynes them together, ἐθελοθρησκία ταπινοφροσύνης; willworship of Humility. That is observable, which *Estius* notes, on the place, the 18. verse, that θελων is referred to θρησκία also; *volens in humilitate, i. affectans humilitatem, & volens in Religione*

*Vid. Append. f.* 23.

*ligione Angelorum*, 1. *affectans*, &c. a voluntary humility, that is, affecting humility and a voluntary worshiping of Angells, that is, affecting that worship: For this the Apostle signifies, in the 23. ver. by composition of the words, in ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ: And it is as if hee had said, let no man beguile you, ἐν ἐθελοταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων: In Will-humility and willworship of Angells; which the Doctor allowes us to call, "*Willworship and an unlawfull thing, a mis-*"*taken impious Humility*, Sect. 23. *and* Sect. 20. *That crime of Superstition.* And so in this ver. 23. wee may apply ἐθελω, to all the 3. Willworship, Wil-Humility and Wil-punishing of the body: And tis very reasonable to conceive, that though it was *praeter usum Graeci sermonis*, so to place the word θέλων, yet the Spirit of God so directed Saint *Paul*, to seperate the words in the 18. verse, and to joyne them in the 23. on purpose, that hee might teach us, not onely (what *Estius* observes) that θέλων in the 18. ver. was to be referred to θρησκεία also; but to teach us also, how to understand ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ in the 23. ver. *viz.* for Worship affected, and sinfull; and humility affected, &c. as well as in the 18. verse: that is, in the Doctors own words, "*unlawfull, Superstitious, impious, worship and Humility.* *Estius in loc.*

§. 23. But he addes the second observation,

on, "*The will or delight in the* 18. ver. *is* "*faſtned on unlawfull things*, viz. *worſhiping* "*of Angels*, &c. *including an impious miſ-* "*taken kind of Humility*, (*call this wil* "*worſhip, or what you pleaſe*) *yet is it true* "*ſtill, that voluntary worſhip, where the* "*matter is perfectly lawfull, not forbidden,* "*nay, approved by a generall commands is far* "*enough from having any tincture of ill in it*, But 1. its true, the *matter* of theſe two *worſhips* differ, conſidered in themſelves, but they differ not at all, in the *unlawfullneſs*, one being more expreſſely forbidden in the *firſt* Commandement, the other by conſequence, or more generally in the ſecond. It is no more lawful, to *revive* a Worſhip, which God hath laid aſide, than it is to *begin* a worſhip, which God never Commanded or forbad: 2. The *matter* of this worſhip in the 23. verſe, was about meats which God had given precepts of before, but now voided: the *matter* was in it ſelfe lawfull: they did but *worſhip* God in a lawfull matter, why doth the Apoſtle blame them for this? (as he doth) if the Doctors aſſertion be true, "*That voluntary* "*worſhip, where the matter is lawfull, is* "*far enough from any tincture of ill?* It will not help him to ſay, "*if not forbidden, nay* "*approved by a generall precept*, for let the *matter* be never ſo lawfull, yet in *Willworſhip* it cannot have any generall precept to ap-

prove

prove it, but rather hath generall and particular precepts to forbid and condemn it. The Doctor still *deludes* us, by the sense of *voluntary worship*; which if he take for *willingness* in commanded worship, wee shall not contend with him; but if for worship *invented* and constituted by the will of man, (as he does) not onely we, but God himself *observes it.*

Being the willing of that, which God forbids: his own words in this sect.

§. 24. "*The* 4. *occasion of the mistake,* "*he saies, is the use the word* ἐθελοπρεισσο-"θρησκεία, *in Epiphanius, attributed to the* "*Phariſes.* This is generally taken in an ill notion, yet finds a *patron* of the Doctor, to defend, or palliate it: I shall not much labour about it; but truly, if ἐθελοθρησκεία heare so ill, the addition of πρείσσων superfluous, to it, will make it here worse. Lets hear what he saies for it.

§. 25. 1. "*If it were a denotation of some* "*ill, it would not prejudice* ἐθελοθρησκεία, for "*the addition in the middle, noting Super-*"*fluity,* (*perhaps, some unlawfull, or luxuri-*"*ant matter, taken into that worship either* "*prohibited object, or noxious, at least bur-*"*thenous ceremonies in number or quality*) "*might turn that into evill, which the vo-*"*luntarineſs, or uncommandednesse of them,* "*were not able to do.* To this I *say;* The superfluity of them consisted not onely, in the *number, burthen, quality,* of them; but even

Supervacaneam religionem sponte assumptum, sive affectatam sit: Estius in ver. 18

in the *voluntary constitution* of them, as *worship* of God; For so our *Saviour* charges them, "*In vain do they worship me*, &c. and thats *Superfluous* worship: And the *uncommandednesse* (if there were nothing else) in a matter of worship, turnes them into ill, and abhominable. For this is the summe of the second Commandement, "*God must be* "*worshiped, with his own prescribed worship*; and conseqnently, all *uncommanded* worship is superfluous, *vain* and sinfull; as hath oft been said.

§. 26. "But secondly he saies, "*I cannot* "*aeknowledge that word is taken by* Epi- "phan: *in an ill sense*: *though that was the* "*Interpretation of their name*; *they might* "*be ill men, yet the name might not signifie* "*any ill thing*. &c. who would think the *Pharisees* should find an advocate, being such *notorious Hypocrites*? The very *name* of their Religion, argues them proud, *vain*, superfluous worshipers, both for *number*, and *burthen* of their *ridiculous* ceremonies, and all of their *own devising*, as parts of worship; and yet the *word* cannot be yeelded to be taken in an ill notion: *Epiphan*: is describing the *Heresie* of the *Pharisees* (awing others) and calls it ἐθελοπειοσοθρησκεία, as *offending*, both in *Willworship* of their owne *devising*, and also in the *abundance* and superfluity of them; and yet the word hath no

ill

ill notion: let him enjoy his own sense of it: Sure, our *Saviour* would not have *condemned* them so *oft*, so sharply, for both these, if the words might have had a *good sense* or notion.

§. 27. "*The truth is, the main crime of the* "*Pharisees, was their censorious proud despi-* "*sing of other men, whom they thought not so* "*godly as themselves.* This is another of the Doctors *mistakes.* Their *main crime* was that, which was the *occasion* of that despising of other men, which was their *Hypocrisie*, which was cloaked with their mantle of *Devotion*, in the *Superfluity* and *Supererogation* of their Traditions, and *Willworship*, which making them *proud* (as all *Willworshipers* are, with a *shew* of wisdom) they *despised* others, whom they thought lesse godly than themselves: "*Luke* 18. 1. *trusted* "*in themselves, that they were righteous,* "*and despised others.* Their *strictnesse* in some particulars, neglected by others, was not so much in *moralls*, as in *ceremonialls* of their own devising, in washings and Fastings, and placing the worship of God in them: as Papists do, and therefore the Doctor *mistakes*, when he applies that Scripture to these, "*these things ought you to have done*, for there it meant of things commanded by God; but then their fault was, that they were *exact* in the *least* commands, and loose *Math.* 23.

in far *greater* matters: Or if they ought to have done their own *Traditions*, why does our Saviour so *bewoe* them, so often, for doing of them? And yet the Doctor saies, "*Their strictnesse in Religion, is far from* "*being it self any ill character or blemish* "*upon their volnntary religious performan-* "*ces, wherein their superlative strictnesse* "*did consist*: Their *Superlative strictnesse* consisted chiefly in the *observation* of their own *Traditions*, even to the *avoiding* of the Commandements of God by them, and does this leave no *blemish* upon them? I say no more, let him consider it.

*Mat.* 15, 6.

§. 28. His third answer for the *Pharisees* is; "*That the Originall of them, was from* "*the* Hasidæi, *so called for their exceſs of* חסידים "*charity, and volnntary performances above* "*what the Law required of them, and so* "*differed from the Karraim, who did that* "*onely which was commanded by the Law*, &c. Its likely to be so: But when he saies, these were called ἐκκοσζομενο, τῶ νόμω, which he renders, "*such as in their obedience per-* "*formed voluntarily some things, which the* "*Law required not, and so differed from the Karæi*. I know not what he means: for the word signifies onely, such as *were devoted voluntarily*, or (as our English Translation reads it) *wellminded to the Law that is the Law of God*: But I think his intention is, to fetch

fetch hence a colour for the *Phariſees* and his own *voluntary* worſhip: whereas the word ἑκούσιον ſignifies onely the *freeneſſe* or *willingneſſe* of the Soul, in the *preſcribed* worſhip of God: For all was to be *voluntary*, and willing ſervice; and Gods people, a *willing people*. Pſ. 110, Now in this ſenſe the *Karæj*, were alſo ἑκουσιαζόμενοι *wellminded*, or voluntarily devoted to the Law: But this word, differs much from ἐθελοθρησκὸς, a *will-worſhiper*, which ſignifies rather (as wee have proved) a *Deviſer* of worſhip, than one *voluntary* in gods preſcribed worſhip: Or if he take ἑκούσια, for thoſe Freewill offerings allowed in the Law, as the 70. render the word: yet in this ſenſe, the *Karæj*, I doubt not; were as *well devoted*, and as *wellminded* to the Law, as the *Haſidæj*: The difference then between them, was rather in this, that the one, in *their worſhip*, kept cloſe to the *Rules* of the Law; the others would *Supererogate* and deviſe *worſhip*, above or beſide the Law: and ſo the Doctor, I think, intends it; Now I beleeve, our Saviour would not have blamed the *Phariſees* for their *Freewill offerings*, or voluntary performances in that ſenſe, becauſe the Law allowed and approved them: but he blames them, for their *Traditions*, their *voluntary worſhip* deviſed by themſelves; which the Doctor calls, their *voluntary performances* above the Law. And

*Populus voluntarium.*

therefore, however *Scaliger* may justifie the *Karæi* for doing onely what was *commanded* of them. He can never justifie the *Hasidæi* for doing more (in the *worship* of God) than was commanded them, unlesse he will condemn our Saviour for *condemning* them: For the rest of the discourse in this Section, I'll all onely note the *progresse* of *Willworship*. At first the *Hasidæi*, (afterwards *Pharisees*) were onely men *devoted*, or well minded to the Law, it seemes, in *words of Charity*; Afterwards, they (finding applause from men) they began to *perform* some *voluntary worship*, which the Law required not. Then at last, their ἐκουσιοσμὸς (as *Scaliger* saies) came to be ἀνάγκη, their *voluntary* worship came to be *necessary*, and formed into precepts; Then from pious men (The *sidim*) they became *Dogmatizers*, laying *obligations* upon all to do as they did; and not being obeyed, *discriminated* themselves from all others, as the *onely obedient servants* of God; and so called themselves *Pharisees*, &c. The application is very easie, and very observable in the new *Pharisees* of *Rome*, and all *Superstitious Willworshipers*, as shall be exemplified in *Hypothesi*, in another place. Yet the Doctor thinks by this meanes to vindicate the word ἐθελοπειοσθησκεία, from any ill sense; as they that *offended* not in the *Willworship*, but in *Dogmatizing*; which yet is not

Festivalls of the Church, *sect.* 16. *ad fin.*

not imported in the word; and he does indeed condemn it; "*we may juſtifie the* "ἐθελοθρησκεία, *but not the* ἐθελοθρησκεία: But I deſire to know whether *Will-worſhip*, I mean, *deviſed worſhip*, in any *one* man, be not ſinfull, though he never come to *Dogmatize*, or lay *obligations* upon others, to do as he does? But the miſchiefe is, that *Willworſhip*, if not ever, yet *commonly*, ends in *Dogmatizing*: eſpecially in *men*, of *place*, and piety, and learning, as is evident in the *Hiſtories* of the Church, in all ages and places.

§. 29, And now wee are come to the third part of his undertaking, "*concerning thoſe* "*voluntary oblations under the Law*, to which he hath often paralelled his *voluntary Worſhip*, by him underſtood in this text, *ſect.* 9. &c. wherein he propounds three obſervations.

But before we deale with thoſe *obſervations* in particular, we ſhall lay down the Nature of a *Freewill-offering*, and ſhew wherein the *Formality* of it did conſiſt, which the Doctor hath neglected to doe. *A Freewill-offering* may be ſo called, two waies.

1. In regard of the *Freewillingneſſe* of the mind of the offerer; *Exod.* 35. 29. "*every* "*man and woman brought a willing offering*, "*whom their heart made willing to bring it*,

&c. But this *Willingneſſe* of the perſon, was required, in the moſt *neceſſary commanded* worſhip, yea every act of *obedience* to God, in both Tables, is to be done *moſt willingly*, by that generall Law, "*Thou ſhalt love the* "*Lord with all thy Heart*, &c. And in this ſenſe, the *Offering* or worſhip is preſuppoſed to be commanded by God: This not here meant.

2. With reſpect to ſome *Liberty* or free choice, left to the *Will* of the offerer, as ſtanding in contradiction to ſuch *offerings* or worſhip, as they were bound to, either by *Law*, or *vow*, as *Sigonius* well obſerves. (Though there was not ſo great a difference between a *vow*, and a *Freewilloffering*, but that, an *offering* by vow, might be called a *Freewilloffering*, in this ſenſe, that it was *free* to vow, or not to vow; though it was *not free* to pay, or not to pay it; And the ſame may be ſaid of a *Freewilloffering* that it was not free to offer it or not, when once it was *promiſed*, though it was free to *promiſe* or not to promiſe it: The difference ſeemes onely *graduall*, a *vow* being a more ſolemne promiſe, and a *Freewilloffering*, voluntarily promiſed, (as the *Hebrewes* expreſſe it) being a *leſſe ſolemn* vow. But this by the way) The *Libertie* left to the offerer, was of 2, ſorts.

*De Repub. Hæbr. l. 4. c. 17.*

*See Ainſw. in Levit. 7. 16.*

1. *Libertas*

1. *Libertas ſpecificationis* (as they call it) when it was left to his *choice*, what he would offer of *ſeverall* things allowed by the Law: Not an *unlimited* liberty, to offer what *kind* of things he would, a *Bear*, or a *Lyon*, of beaſts, or a *Vulture* or *Eagle* of Fowles; But onely ſome one or other of thoſe three kinds of beaſts. *Beeves*, *Goates*, *Sheep*, or of thoſe two kinde of *fowles* preſcribed by the Law, *Pigeons*, or *Turtles*: (which *choice*, was allowed in other ſorts of offerings, as well as in thoſe that were properly called *Freewilloffe-rings*, which is obſervable.) And this *Liberty* was not (I ſay) unbounded, but much *limited*, as in theſe particulars. *Ainſw. on Levit.* 1. 2.

1. It was not left free to any man, in the leaſt kind, to appoint the *kind* of his own offering, not appointed by God; but to chuſe amongſt things inſtituted by God, that which did beſt agree, with his own *condition*, and ability: So that God, it ſeemes, had reſpect to the ſeverall *abilities* of men; ſome were *rich*, and able to offer a greater ſacrifice; a *Sheep*, or a *Goat*, or a *Bullock*: others were *poor*, and had not any of thoſe, and then allowed to offer a pair of *Pidgeons*, &c. which is the expreſſe reaſon, of that Law, *Levit.* 12. 6. 8. A *lamb* was required for an offering for a womans *Purification*, with one *Pigeon*, or a *Turtle dove*: But if not able to bring a *Lamb*, then two *Turtles*,

or

or two *Pigeons*: To teach us, that if there be a *willing mind*, it is accepted according to *what he hath*, not what he hath not. The widowes two mites accepted, *&c.*

2. There was a generall Law, that the *Freeſt offerings*, were to be, according to the *meaſure* of Gods *bleſſing*, *Deut*, 16. 10. whence it had been a *ſinne* for any *Iſraelite*, whom God had *plentifully* bleſſed, to offer a *pair* of Pigeons inſtead of a *Bullock*, upon his own meer pleaſure. And this law, is renewed in the Goſpell, 1 *Cor.* 16. 2. "*Let every* "*man lay by him in ſtore, as God hath proſ-* "*pered him*, viz. for the poor.

*Act.* 11: 29. *See ſect.* 32.

3. Where the *choice* was allowed, and taken, as of a *Goat*, or a *Sheep*, &c. that choice was no *formall worſhip*; but a *circumſtance* in a commanded worſhip.

4. It had not been *lawfull* in that choice, for the Prieſts to *require*, or them to *offer neceſſarily* one of them, as a more *ſpeciall worſhip*, than the other: *e. g.* when *liberty* was left, to offer a *Sheep* or a *Goat*; a Pigeon or a Turtle dove, *&c.* to make it *neceſſary* to offer a Sheep, and *unlawfull* to offer a Goat, *&c.* had been plain *Willworſhip*; So that here is little *liberty* left to man, to appoint a *worſhip* of Ged, which he commanded not; and the *Formality* of a *Freewill* offering, did not conſiſt in that.

5. In that liberty of *choice*, yet God gave

*rules*

*rules* and directions, how they ſhould be ordered, *Levit.* 22. 20. *not maimed or blemiſhed*, &c. And that of the firſt kind of liberty; there is another.

2. *Libertas exercitij*; when it was *left free*, in ſome caſes, for a man to *offer*, or not to offer; beyond what was *poſitively* required by the Law: If thou wilt offer a *Nedabah*, a Freewilloffering, *&c.* And herein onely, or chiefly ſtands the *Formality* of a Freewill-offering, as contradiſtinguiſhed to thoſe *offerings* which were commanded by the Law: and the *Leviticallneſſe* or *Ceremoniality* of them, ſeems to lie here, whereby they are now aboliſhed: God did than by *ſpeciall allowance*, give *liberty* for *Freewillofferings*, not onely in regard of the *Specification* of the offering, of this or that *kind*, but alſo the *Liberty of exerciſe*, to offer or not to offer, excepting in caſes commanded: If they *offered* not, they did not ſin, and if they *offered*, it was the more *accepted*. And of this kind of *Freewillofferings* the Doctor intends his diſcourſe; when he paralells his *voluntary oblations* with thoſe of the Law, and calls them *voluntary worſhip*, not commanded by God, and yet accepted by him; as ſhall appear in conſidering his three obſervations, beginning at *ſect.* 29.

1. "*That they were a part of the worſhip* "*and ſervice of God, when they were performed*

"*formed, and therefore avowed by thoſe ge-*
"*nerall precepts, which reſpect that worſhip of*
"*his.* To which we ſay, 1. That they were parts of the *worſhip* of God, in thoſe times, is true, not (or not onely) becauſe they were *avowed* by the generall *precepts*, which reſpected that worſhip; but rather, becauſe they were *allowed* by ſpeciall *Proviſo's* of God himſelf. For, I aske; If God had not declared his *allowance* (beſides his *directions* and regulations) of them, whither it had beene lawfull for the *Jewes*, to have offered them or no? I believe not, as ſhall be ſhewed anon: 2. I deſire it may be *obſerved*, that thoſe *voluntary oblations*, were a *part* of Gods worſhip: ſo, by proportion, muſt his *voluntary oblations* in the Goſpell, be accounted a *part* of worſhip, not *rites*, or *degrees*, or *circumſtances* of worſhip: Let it be remembred againſt anon.

2. "*That they were not particularly com-*
"*manded, by any particular command of*
"*Gods Law, but were left to every mans li-*
"*berty (except in caſe of a vow, which yet*
"*it was free for him not to make) and ſo*
*were ſpontaneous, not neceſſary.* This is alſo true in part, they had no *particular* command, but they had a ſpeciall *allowance* of God, which was as good, and *equivalent* to a command, though not to *neceſſitate* the doing, yet to *authorize* them being done: o-

ther-

therwiſe men were at libertie; But why doth, he except a *vow*? I conceive, becauſe if a man had *vowed*, it was now *neceſſary* for him to perform it; but ſo, if he had *devoted* a freewill offering, it was not free for him, to withold it: There is a Law, *Levit.* 27. 13. that if hee would offer to change his oblation, hee muſt adde a fift part more to it.

3. "*There is a Law*, Levit. 22. 20. *not* "*to offer them maimed, or blemiſhed, whence* "*appeares they were voluntary, and yet allow-*"*ed and accepted.* They were to be offered, becauſe *allowed*, and becauſe allowed, therefore *accepted*, not becauſe they were *voluntary* onely. But what will the Doctor inferre from all this? "*That he cannot ſee, why* "*there may not be ſomewhat in Chriſtianity,* "*of the ſame conſtitution alſo, voluntary, and* "*not particularly impoſed, and yet allowed* "*by, and acceptable to God.* This inference, I fear, hath toomuch of the λογος σοφιας ſpoken of in the text, a *ſhew of Wiſdom*, but neither *ſubſtance, power*, nor *truth*, in it: For this *plauſible* argument hath deceived *Papiſts*, into an ἐθελοθρησκειαν καὶ ταπεινοφροσυνην, an *abundant ſuperfluity* of willworship, it was ſo in the *old Teſt:* therfore it may be ſo in the *New*: There was an *High Prieſt* over all, *ergo* there muſt be an *univerſal B.* now: They had their *ſacrifices* then, ſo muſt the *Church* now; In a word, thus *Bellarm.* argues, in a caſe near ours, if

not

not the same; "*vowes and freewilliofferings* "*were part of the worship of God then,* "*therefore they are so now*: And this seemes reasonable to the Doctor in the present case: "*He cannot see, but there may be somewhat* "*of the same constitution now,* &c. When as *Divines* resolve against them, "*that the wor-* "*ship of God then, was far different from the Worship of the Gospell*; 1. And conclude the contrary, it rather followes, they are not *parts* of worship now; because that *Levitical* worship is abolished, therefore we must have a *certain* and *special* word in the new Testament, to make any thing a *part* of worship, whence his second inference is like the former; "*He cannot see, why he that doth any* "*such thing, may not be called* ἐθελοθρησκος, "*and the oblation or action it selfe,* ἐθελοθρησκεια. He may, we grant, be so called, a *Will-worshiper*, not a *God-worshiper*; and the oblation, *Willworship* (in an ill sense) not a *worship* of God; as wanting *Truth*, command, or allowance of the *New* Testament, which those had in the *Old*: Yet we shall not stick to grant, "*that whatsoever may,* "*by the Doctrine of the Gospell, appeare to* "*be acceptable to Christ, and yet is not com-* "*manded, by any particular command; or* "*which is commanded for the act, but not* "*for the specification of it, to time, or place, or degree.* For this first is certain, that no *worship*

*Chamier T. 3. l. 20. c. 5. s. 25. 754. Chemint. Exod. A. 3. p. 50.*

ſhip (marke that, wee ſpeake of *Worſhip*) is acceptable to Chriſt, which he hath not *Commanded*; either in particular, or by general *allowance*. 2. Our queſtion is, not about *circumſtances*, of time, place, or *degree*, of worſhip commanded; but about *voluntary worſhip* (as he calls it *Will-worſhip*, (as wee) deviſed by *men* themſelves. Now his *Inſtances* will be eaſily anſwered.

§. 30. "*God commanded not* David *to* "*build him a Temple, nor to make tender of* "*that ſervice*, 2 Sam. 7. 5. *Yet* Davids *in*-"*tention in that deſign, though exeeeding* "*Gods Command, is very acceptable to God*; 1 King. 8. 18. This is one of *Bellarmines* arguments, for their *Religious vowes*; and its fully anſwered by learned *Chamier* thus: 1. This was in the time of the *Law* or before Chriſt; but the times of the Goſpell give no ſuch *allowance*; *Freewill-offerings* were then allowed, it appeares not, they are ſo now: 2. God doth not abſolutely deny, that he had *Commanded*, but ſayes, he had not *Commanded* it to *David*, or any *before him*, not becauſe he would not have it done, but becauſe not yet, and therefore foretels that *Solomon* ſhould build it. 3. The houſe that *David* would build, was not to be a *part* of worſhip *properly*, but by accident, as it ſerves for the *Commodity* and *convenience* of the worſhipers: no more than the *Houſe* of *Obededom*, *Vbi ſuper.*

or

or the *place* where *David* ſetled the Arke and Tabernacle before, was a *part of worſhip*, or our *Churches* now; God had ſaid by *Moſes*, that hee would chuſe a *place* for himſelfe to dwell in; and then, when he had *choſen* and *ſanctified* it, it was a part of that *legall* worſhip: *David* had read this, and thought, that *time* was now at hand, he therefore prepares *materialls* for the *Houſe*; but could not make it a *part* of worſhip, without Gods command: and then it is nothing to our preſent queſtion. It was onely a *circumſtance* of worſhip, not any part of worſhip.

2. The inſtance of Saint *Paul*, "*not taking hire of the Corinthians, when hee might, and calling it matter of boaſting*, &c. is as little to the purpoſe, if not leſſe; for it is not in a *matter* of *Worſhip*, "*but an action of common life* (as himſelf ſpeakes) yet it is alſo a miſtake, to call it a נדבה a *free will offering*, when it was a *due debt*: For ſo *Chamier* anſwers *Bellarm.* objecting this place for works of counſails, as they call them: And he proves it by a *diſtinction*, that he did that which was above or beſide the *generall* command, or allowance, "*That they* "*that preacht the Goſpell ſhould live of* "*the Goſpell*, but not above what he was bound to doe, by a *ſpeciall call*, from the circumſtance of time and place: for he was *bound*, not onely to *Preach* the Goſpell, but alſo

alſo to take heed that he did nothing to *hinder* the ſucceſſe: which he confirms from the words of the Apoſtle there, 1 *Cor.* 9. 18. "*That I make the Goſpell of Chriſt without charge, that I abuſe not my power in the Goſpell.* But to *abuſe* his power, is to ſin: which he had done, if he had *received* his *hire* to the *hindering* of the Goſpell. His *glorying* and boaſting therefore, was, in reſpect to the *generall* command, not to the *ſpeciall* occaſion: It was therefore no *Free-will offering.*

§. 31. The like may be anſwered for the other inſtance: "*He might* (*ſaies he*) *have abſtained from going up to* Jeruſalem, *Act.* 21. *a Prophet told him, that bonds expected him there,* ver. 11. *and in that caſe to flye was juſtifiable, by* Math 10. 23. *yet* Paul *would needs go up,* ver. 13. *that was his* נדבה *again.* Some anſwer, this was an *Inſtinct* or Heroicall motion of the *Spirit*, (which the Doctor diſcourſes againſt, *Sect.* 35. &c.) but we need not that *help*, It is enough to anſwer as before; By the *generall allowance*; *Paul* might have fled, (for there is no command, whereby Preachers are bound, to be *bound, beaten, ſtoned*) but yet, if he ſhould have refuſed to ſuffer with the *retarding* of the Goſpell, he had ſurely ſinned, and ſo, this was uo *Freewilloffering*, neither.

§. 32. The next of works of mercy, "*that* "*though they be commanded in generall, yet* "*the* quantum, *how much every rich man* "*should set apart, is not defined,* &c. May be answered by what is said afore in part, *viz.* that it is not the question, which is, of *worship*, not of *actions* of civill life: But wee adde;

1. It may be said, that the question is not of the *degree* of an Act of obedience, commanded, as *Almsgiving* is, but of the *Act* it self, if not *commanded* now allowed in speciall, or iu generall.

Sect. 42. *see pract. catech. p.* 141. 2. *Edit.*

2. The Doctor himself confesses "*its possi-* "*ble for a man to offend* (*in charity*) *either* "*in too prodigall a giving, against prudence,* "*or in too parsimonious sparing, against pie-* "*tie.* But then, may it not be said, there is some *midle rule*, that binds men, from both the *excess* and the *defect*? which if it be *resolved* on, there is a *debt*, and no נדבה no *Freewill offering*: Besides, in his section, the Doctor saies, "*that there was a proportion,* "*among the Jewes, which they were obliged* "*to, which was called their Righteousnesse,* "*which performed, satisfied the obligation of* "*the Law, and that which exceeded, was a-* "*bundance or excellency of goodness, or mer-* "*cy.* True, there was a *proportion* set, by a speciall Law, (least men should *give* nothing) but there was also a *generall* Law, to give

give according to Gods prospering of them, and their ability; as 1 *Cor.* 16. 2. cited by the Doctor, as an *apointment* of Saint *Paul*, and so obliging, to which, if we adde, the *circumstance* of time and place, and persons, in regard of *Necessities* of the poore; there will be little cause to think or boast of a נדבה, a *Freewilloffering*, but it may prove a *due debt*, and, and sin, if it be not done.

See practic. Catech. 2. Edit. Deut. 16. 10. 17.

§. 33, 34. As for his Instance of *prayer*, for the *manner*, Orall, or mentall, *publick* or private; the *frequencie*, &c. we answer very briefly; *Prayer* is no doubt a *part* of worship, commanded by God, and therefore is so far, to the question; but as for the *manner*, Orall, or Mentall, with such and such *gestures* of body; for *time when*, *how oft*, &c. (except any of these be by God himself commanded in speciall;) they are not to be accounted *properly worship*, but *circumstances*, Rites, *&c.* and Worship, left to the *liberty* of every person; and so againe, though they be *Free*, yet are not *parts* of worship: For these being *helps* unto worship, or *testifications* of inward or outward worship, if a man should make any *one way* necessary, or any one of them, more *holy* and *Religious*, in themselves, or more *efficacious*, to himself, or more *acceptable* to God; no doubt it would be in him, *Willworship*; because God hath left them *free* and

indifferent; and nothing makes them *worship* but Gods *Command*: Now the Doctor must again be remembred, that he defends *voluntary worship*; not *voluntariness* in prescribed worship (which is *necessary* as we have again said) but worship *devised* by the *wit*, or constituted by the *Wil* of man; and *not commanded* by God. Which if we will maintain to be *lawfull*, and place the *worship* of God in them, or *pleasing* of God by them; I know not, how he will avoide *compliance* with *Papists*; who have made many *worships* of God, which he never commanded, as *caelibate* or *single life*; *pennances*, *pilgrimages*, set houres of prayer, and innumerable such things, and are condemned by our *Divines*, as the greatest *Willworshipers*, and *Idolaters*, in the world.

And whereas the Doctor saies, *Sect.* 34. concerning *frequent prayer* (as 7. times a day, *&c.*) "*The matter of it is commanded*, "*to wit*, *prayer*, *but not the frequent reiterating* "*of it daily*. If he mean it, of the *particular number*, of seaven times a day, its true: but if in generall, of *frequent* prayer, and that *every day*, it is against the very scope of the text, *pray continually*: amd so will prove a debt, and not a נדבה *Freewilloffering*. Himselfe seemes to expound it, by *twice* a day, morning and evening, at *least*, and saies that "*a Christian now may do well to*

"*im-*

"improve it in publick and private to six or "seaven times a day. But I think, the sense of the precept, *pray continually*, hath respect to the *frequent necessities* and occasions of men, every day, and binds men to pray so oft as *need* shall be, with *ejaculatory* prayer at least; and then again, it is a *debt*, and no נדבה, *Nedabah*, no *voluntary oblation*.

§. 39. We *wave* the 4. following Sections, after the 34. because wee *wave* that answer, which in them, the Doctor disputes against, But we cannot let passe, what he addes about the *difference*, between a *Precept*, and *grace*, which he makes to be very great.

1. "*In that the precept belongs to all, the* "*grace to none but him that hath it* (*and* "*not obliging him neither, unless the matter* "*of it, be* sub præcepto *all ready, and he ob-* "*liged to it, by some other command.*) The difference between a *Precept*, and a *Grace*, is granted; but that a *Grace* should not oblige, unlesse the *matter* be commanded him, by some other command, is not true. For *Grace given*, being a *Talent*, is given on purpose to improve, as well as a precept; This is clear as in 1 *Cor.* 12. 7. "*The manifesta-* "*tion of the Spirit, is given to every one, to* "*profit withall*, and in 1 *Pet.* 5. 10. So in the Parable of the *Talents*, the *scope* whereof is, "*That whatever Talent any man is be-*

"trusted with, the intention of the Doner "is, that he should improve it, to his advan- "tage, though he lay no command particu- larly upon him: And the not using of it, is punished severely: *Take him, and cast him*, &c. for hee acknowledgeth his *Lord did* ex- pect the improvement; *I knew*, &c. whats the second difference?

2. "*Because it is the design of a precept, to* "*lay an obligation, and that* sub pericnlo a- "nimæ, *if not obeyed; but of grace not so,* "*but onely to strengthen and incline, which he* "*that makes use of, as he should, is promised* "*a reward*, &c. This is strange Divinity: Does God give *Grace* onely to *strengthen* and incline, and leave men *free* to *use* it, or not *use* it? so *grace* might be given in vaine: But does not Saint *Math.* say, "*Take him and* "*cast him into utter darknesse*, for not using his Talent? and is he not threatned with loss of his Talent, for not using it? and is not that a punishment for some sin? yes, "*but its* "*clear by Saint* Luke, 19. 13. *that there* "*was a precept of occupying; to which the* "*punishment was apportioned*, True, but had here been no such particular precept, yet the *Gift* it self implyed that *duty* of imployment, and therefore *Mathew* leaves that out; And there he acknowledges presently, "*I ac-* "*knowledge, that the bringing God no re-* "*return of all his grace, is a great and a*

"*dam-*

"*damning sin.* Thats true, say I, when he gives any *grace*, (though he say nothing) even by the Law of *Creation*, whereby the *rationall Creature* is bound to be *subservient* to the glory of his Creator: But this last *grant*, hee in a manner, takes away againe in the next words; "*But then, that comes not home, to* "*to prove it a sinne, to omit the doing of any* "*one particular, in that degree, which Gods* "*grace enables me to doe; there being no ob-* "*ligation* ad semper, *or* ad gradum; *to doe it* "*alwaies, or in such a degree.* But surely, as *grace* it self, so any *measure* or *degree* of grace (being a *Talent* also) requires a proportionable *return*, to that degree.

The Lord, in the parable expected an increase of of *one* Talent, for his *one* Talent, as well as *two*, for *two*, and five for five; and he was punished as well for not improving his one, to two, as for bringing in no increase; And if he that had received five Talents, had brought in the increase but of two, I believe he had heard of it from his Lord, and beene Chidden, if not punished for it. Though it be true also, that there is no *Obligation ad semper*, yet *semper*, as *opportunity* is offered; *Gal.* 6. 10. As, as long, as much, while wee have opportunity, lets do good, *&c.* and so the *degree* of the grace, *binds* to a *gradnall* improvement: "*To whom more is given, of* "*him more is required*, is expresse Scripture;

And this expreſſion of the Doctor, "*that* "*there is onely an obligation* ad ſpeciem, *not* "ad gradum, *that is, that the thing be* "*done, for kind, not to the degree of Grace re-ceived* Savours too much of the Romiſh gloſs, to ſay no more.

§. 40. 41. *Object.* *Prudence* will require us to do that which is *fitteſt* to be done, and ſo nothing is free, *&c.* He anſwers, "*That e-*"*very man is not bound under pain of ſin,* "*to be prudent, or pious, or merciſull, in ſuch* "*a degree,* &c. Truely every man is bound to be *prudent*, to that degree of prudence; which he *loſt* by ſin; and every man is bound to be *pious*, in the *higheſt degree*; the Law requires *perfection of holineſſe*, (ſay we) and the Goſpell requires yet *Greater* perfection, (ſaies he; *pract. catech.* 2^d. *Edit.* *p.* 94, 95.) and every man is *bound* to be merciſull to his ability, as our *Heavenly Father* is merciſull, (which ſure is the *higheſt degree*) though every man be not bound to the ſame *degree*, of mercy, with other men; becauſe every man hath not, either the ſame *meaſure*, of abilities, or the ſame *opportunities*. But theſe ſuppoſed, as a man in extream need, and my abilities conſidered, I am bound to give ſo much as will ſupply his neede; and to give *leſſe*, were neither, *prudent*, nor *pious*, what ever it were to give more

§. 42.

§. 42. And here he confesses, "*Its possible* "*to offend against prudence in too prodigall a* "*giving, and in too parsimonious, against* "*piety*; but yet would evade the decision of the just proportion, two wayes.

1. "*The possibilitie and danger of such* "*faults in the extreames, proves not the un-* "*lawfulness or necessitie of any other degree* "*within those extreams, but allows a lati-* "*tude, within which a man may be more or* "*lesse mercifull still, and yet prudent too.* To which I say, Virtue (and Charity is such a virtue) consists in a *middle point* between two extreames; therefore, if it swerve from that *point* to either extreame, it is more or lesse a *fault*, though not observed, perhaps not *observable* by men, yet justly *punishable*, by a righteous God. And in *strict* and rigorous Justice, in such *deviations*, a man will bee found neither *mercifull*, nor *prudent*, but he: sayes,

2. "*Though prudential considerations doe* "*direct, yet do they not alwaies command, or* "*lay obligations upon us, and therefore still* "*compatible with voluntary oblations.* Yes, *Prudence* it self being a virtue, in our created nature; then certainly it *commanded*, and obliged to do what was *fittest*; and so it doth still; that what is *short* of the Rule, by our *imprudence*, is a *fault*, though pardonable by Grace.

*Sect.* 43. 44.

*Sect.* 43. 44. Another objection he starts, from hence. "*That prudence, knowing the* "*greatest perfection, to be most gloriously re-* "*warded, would advise and bind a man to a-* "*spire to perfection, and not to content him-* "*self with any thing but the best.* This seems at first sight, to touch upon the *mercenarie*, or *meritorious* way of *Romanists*; and we sho uld not have framed such an objection: For there being a *two-fold perfection*, the one of *Grace*, or holinesse, the other of *Glory*; true *Prudence* looks first at the *perfection* of *Holinesse*, and by the by, or secondarily at the *perfection* of *Glory*: leaving that to God; though God is pleased to give us this help to provoke us to *perfection* of *holiness*. Now when *prudence* looks first and primarily at *perfection* of *Glory*, it seems misplaced. For true *Prudence* should first look at the *command* of God, and the *beauty* of *Holinesse*, and should advise us, to seek that *first*, and for it selfe: Not to look at *Glory*, to make us *Holy*, but at *Holiness* to make us *glorious*: And this is true *prudence* indeed, which advises a man to doe the *best* to arrive at the *perfection* of *Grace*, upon the command of God, *&c.* But let us consider his answers.

1. "*Though prudence do advise one to this,* "*yet doth it not lay any command, which hath* "*power of obliging, so as not to obey it, will* "*be presently sinfull*, &c. What *Prudence* doth

doth he meane? If it be a *carnal* Prudence (for it is no better) advising *onely*, or *first*, to look at the *perfection* of Glory, that indeed does not lay any *obligation* upon us. But if it be true *divine Prudence*, looking at the perfection of *Virtue*, required by the *commands* of God, it doth lay strong obligations upon us; so as if wee obey it not it is sinfull. Nor does it thereby cease to bee *prudentiall*, because of that command, which makes it *necessary*, but is *prudentially necessarie*.

2. He saies, "*Though it is prudent to use* "*those means which may advance us highest* "*in glory, and perfection will doe that, yet* "*'twill not alwaies be prudence to undertake* "*the way of perfection, because that being* "*an high steep, may be also a dangerous way;* "*every man cannot receive it*, &c. What *perfection* does he mean will be *dangerous* to undertake as a steep way, *&c.*? The perfection of *Virtue*, or *Holiness* required in the Commandments of Law, and Gospel? Sure that, though it be *steep* and high, yet it is no *dangerous* way at all; but the most *safe*, *peaceable*, and *easiest way*, if the *Word* may be beleeved. But I guesse by that phrase, "*E-* "*very man cannot receive it*, that he meanes it of the *Romish celibate*, * or *Virginity*, or *Martyrdome*, the rather because he adds, "*For him that cannot overcome the difficul-*

"*ties*

Which is not commanded, any but looked on as the greatest degree of perfection.

"*ties to resolve upon the course, may perhaps* "*be precipitious*, &c. That is, every man hath not that *gift*, and for him to undertake that way (of *perfection*) may be dangerous, and *precipitious* indeed. Now to undertake the way of *perfection* in Holinesse, cannot be *dangerous* to any, but is the duty of all, and every man may receive it, that in *sincerity* looks after it, at least to acceptation. And then that which he adds is as strange: "*That in* "*the undertaking of the way of perfection*, "*even the precept of God may interpose some-*

*Quer.* of Divorse *sect* 36.

It may be a duty sometimes not to aspire to some perfection. *Sect.* 45.

"*times, and trase us, and make it unlawfull* "*for us to aspire to the most perfect state.* I pray does the *precept* of God *interpose* at any time, or (as he speaks) *trase* us in the way of *perfection* in Holinesse? Doe Gods precepts *cross* one another in that way of perfection? Or rather is not *perfect obedience* to the precepts of God holiness and perfection it self? Does Gods precept make it, *unlawfull* for us to *aspire* to the most *perfect* state, which calls us to it? What strange *Divinitie* is this! But hear him speak, and explain himself. "*As* "*if the discharge of a duty of our calling* "*should await us on one side, and an oppor-* "*tunity of martyrdome, on t'other side, then* "*in that case obedience is better then that* "*richest Sacrifice, as in* Cyprians *case*, &c. By this its evident, he means not the *perfection* of Holines according to the Commandements

dements of God, but a conceited *perfection* of *martyrdome* as *Papiſts* do: But does God *call* all men, at all times to *martyrdom*? Is there any command for *all men* to be Martyrs? Yet there is a command for *all men* to obey God, to be perfectly holy; and no command of God *interpoſes*, or *traſes* us in this: Yea if a man, *ambitious* of Martyrdom (his *higheſt perfection*) ſhould with *neglect* of obedience to a commaud of God, in diſcharge, but of a *duty* of his calling, *aſpire* to Martyrdome, he would ſcarce deſerve the name of a *Martyr*, but of ſomething elſe which I will not name. The *Providence* of God indeed may *interpoſe* and *traſe* us, (by denying us *abilities* to do more good, or leaving *corruptions* to buffet us, that we cannot do the *good* we would (as *Paul complaines*) for reaſons beſt known to himſelfe. But then, who knows not, "*That if there be a willing* "*mind, it is accepted, according to what a* "*man hath, not according to what he hath* "*not*. And his reward (for ought we know) may be accordingly; *equall* with thoſe that have more abilities and opportunities of *doing* good, or *ſuffering* ill for Chriſt. Any man, all men, are alwayes bound to *aſpire* to the *perfection* of Holineſſe, not to the *perfection* of Martyrdome. And now wee goe on. *See pract. Cat. 2 Edit. pag. 98.*

§. 46. "*But then thirdly, the perfection*

"*we*

"we are commanded by Christ to aspire to, is "capable of degrees; as in charitie or merci- "fulnesse, Mat. 5.48. for so expounded Luke "6.36. Wee shall grant him this, and yet deny his *voluntary oblations* still: For wee say, there are degrees *of*, or rather *to* perfecti- on here; upon *condition*, that he will grant, that *every degree*, even the *highest*, is required by the Law of God, and what is *short* of the *highest* degree, is so farre *culpable*; and then it will follow, that there can be no נדבה, no *voluntary oblation*. Let him hear St. *Hierom* speak our sense in this, "Charitas quæ non "potest augeri, &c. *Charitie which cannot be* "*increased as long as man lives here, is in no* "*man*; *but as long as it may be increased;* "*truly what is less then it ought to be,* * *is* "*faulty*; *by which faultinesse there is no just* "*man on earth, who doth good, and sinneth* "*not*. It is spoken in generall of the *Love* of God and man, but easily applyed to *Charity* strictly so called. But the Doctor goes on. "*If there be any perfection attainable in this* "*life, 'twill be capable of degrees, and growth* "*also*. Whether he be of their mind who hold *perfection possible* in this life, I cannot say; but this I can say, he speaks *contradicti- ons*; for *perfection* admits of no *degrees* or growth; but rather *degrees* and growth in Grace (which are oft commanded) argue there is no *perfection* in this life. The Doctor goes

Epist. 62.

In vitio est.

goes on ſtill. "*If it be not acquirable in this* "*life, 'tis certainly not under Evangelicall* "*precept now; that light and ſupportable* "*burthen, that rod of not grievous*, i.e. *poſ-* "*ſible commands, which Chriſt, & his grace* "*brought into the world.* This is ſtrong and ſtrange confidence. For firſt, doth not the Law it ſelf (ſtill in force under the Goſpel) require *perfect obedience* of Chriſtians? Did it not ever do ſo, as the eternall *Rule* of righteouſneſſe, and ever will? All *Orthodox* Divines have ever thought ſo, and maintained it againſt the *Church* of *Rome*. Onely, the Doctor, I finde, is of the ſame judgement with them of *Rome*, and ſticks not to charge the Law, before Chriſt, with *Imperfection*. Hear his words, *Pract. Catech.* pag. 94. 2 *Edit.* "*The Law & Commandements of God had* "*before ſome mixture of Imperfection, but* "*now have none; had before ſome vacuities* "*in them, which now are filled up by Chriſt.* Viderit ipſe.

But ſecondly, doth not the Goſpel alſo call for the *perfection* of the Law? *Be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect*, are the words of Chriſt himſelfe. But leaſt hee ſhould ſay, as here *ſect.* 46. by perfection there, is meant *mercifulneſſe* (though that will little advantage him) what ſayes he to that place of the Goſpel, *Be ye holy, as he is holy*? 1 *Pet.* 1.15,16. Which is taken out of the

the Law, *Levi.* 11. 44. &c. Did God then or the Gospell now, call men to an *Imperfect Holinesse* and set God for their *patterne*? But doth not the Doctor himself say, "*Christ* "*came to perfect the Law*? in his *Catech*: *supra* pag. 93. and to set it *higher*, than before? And yet is he *certain* and confident, "*perfection is not under evangelicall precept* "*now*? And is not that *perfection*, the *perfection* of the *Law* still, though it be required by the Gospell? Doth not the *Gospell* call for the *perfection* of the *Law*, upon new *motives*, of the *Covenant* of Grace, of the *merits* and *death* of Christ? upon indeed *better termes*; as *mediating*, that if we doe (as we do) *fall short* of that perfection, yet we shall be *pardoned* all our failings.

And thirdly, I aske, what it is, that makes the *burthen* of Christ, (requiring the same, (the Doctor saies, greater) perfection of the Law) "*so light and supportable, the rod of* "*command, so not grievous*, i. e. *possible*? let the Doctor answer the question himselfe, in his *Catech. p.* 95. "*It is made lighter by* "*Christ*, 1. *in taking off that unprofitable* "*burthen of ceremonies, that had nothing* "*good in them* (durius dictum,) 2. *in respect* "*of the damning power of every least sin or* "*breach under the first covenant, to the be-* "*leever taken away in the second.* 3. *in re-* "*gard of greater strength given.* &c. It was not

was not then the lightneſſe of the burthen; that hee required not *perfect Holineſſe* under the Goſpell (for that he does 2 *Cor.* 7. 1.) but that, if by *repentance*, faith and *love*, we *ſincerely* endeavour after *perfection*, firſt our *faſtings* ſhall be pardond, 2. and our *weake works* accepted, through *Chriſt* our *mediator*. But ſtill *perfection*, (though not acquirable here) is under *Evangelicall* precept.

§. 47. Whence it is apparent, that that ſo plauſible aſſertion (as the Doctor calls it:) "*that every one is bound to doe that which is* "*beſt*, is not (as he) *diſcernibly* falſe, but *viſibly* true; For if the Law (and Goſpell alſo) require *perfection* of *obedience*, in every Commandement, then it *bends* every man to doe that which is *beſt*: And his arguments againſt it, are little worth: 1. For the Teſtimonie of the Apoſtle, 1. *Cor.* 7. 28. "*He that giveth in marriage doth well, and* "*he that giveth not, doth better.* For 1. *well* and *better* there, do not referre to *morall goodneſſe* but *Worldly good*, in regard of the *prevention* of troubles, in thoſe *afflicted*, and perſecuting times: *Marriage* is, in it ſelfe, a thing *indifferent*, and ſo it may be *good* for ſome to marry, and *better* for others not to marry.

2. The matter is, how the *parties* are diſpoſed; If a man have not the *gift* of continence

nence, it is not onely *good*, but *necessary* for him to marry, rather than to burn: and here it cannot be said, "*he that giveth not in mar-*"*riage doth better*, but doth very *ill*. If a man had the gift of continency, is was *better*, (in those times, *for the present distresse*, *ver.* 26.) not to marry, but still with respect to *Worldly*, not *morall* good. 2. His other argument is as weak; "*That the best, being a* "*superlative, supposes the positive to be good*; "*whereas if all were bound to do that which* "*is best, that which were onely good, were e-*"*vill; for so is whatever comes short of what* "*we are bound to do.* I hope the Doctor will not deny, but *works done by faith* are Good; and yet, that they are not *perfect* in this life, that is; *come short* of what wee are bound to doe, if not by the *Law*, yet by the Gospell; will he now say, they are *evill*? They are called *good*, by the *indulgence*, and *acceptance* of God, in Christ; but not *strictly* or perfectly good: He knowes who said it. *Omnis humana justitia injustitia esse convincitur, si districtè judicetur.*

*Greg. moral. lib. 9. c. 1.*

§. 48. The next *Objection* raised by him, helps to confirme the former answer; The Law is, "*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God,* "*with all thy heart, soul, strength*, &c. which implyes the utmost *endeavour*, to perfection, in all our obedience, He answers, "*that that* "*phrase denoteth onely two things.* 1. *sincerity*

Sect. 49.

of

"*of his love of God, as opposed to partiall* "*divided love or service:* 2. *the loving him* "*above all other things, not admitting any* "*thing in competition with him, or in such a* "*degree of love.* But we say, 1. That both *these* are noted & required, we grant but deny that *onely* these are required, for the Law required perfect love (*John* 4. 18. *perfect love, casteth out fear*) such as was in *Adam* in innocency; but that is not *acquirable* in this life: 2. If he will but grant, that whatever *comes short* of that perfection, needs (and by *grace* shall find) a *pardon*, and be accepted; we contend no farther. For let it be *supposed*, yea granted, that *sincere love, is capable of degrees*, whither in the *same man*, at severall times, or *two men* at the same time, and so both *obey* the precept; yet those *degrees*, and *growth* of love, do argue love not to be *perfect* (and so not strictly answerable to the Law) & so farre *faulty, in vitio*, as *Hierome* said, above.

But what shall wee say to that *Instance* of Christ himselfe; "*Who, we know, did never* "*fail, in performing what was mans dutie in* "*prayer, or any thing else; yet at that time,* "Luk. 22. 24. *prayed more earnestly; which* "*is a demonstrative evidence, that the low-* "*er degree, is not necessarily sinfull, when* "*the higher is acceptable to God, which when* "*it is granted, there will be no doubt but* "*these freewill-offerings, will be reconcilea-*

"ble with that command; and so room left for a voluntary oblation. But wee say to this, This example of Christ, will not be applyable to men. For Christ was above the Law; and did more then the Law required, and did supererogate in many his actions, and passions; and so in the degree of affection in prayer, if not in the prayer it self: But men are so farre from Supererogating by any service, prayer, or the like; that they fall many degrees short of what is required, and due from them, and so no room left for freewil-offerings, as his volvntary oblations. Yet thus much that example holds forth, that greater pressures and necessities, call for enlargement of affections: not as voluntary oblations, but as duties.

§. 50. &c. And this makes way for another, and the last objection; "That if it be "granted possible for a Christian, to do more, "than he is commanded, he may then super-"erogate, as the Romanists teach. The Doctor answers.

1. "There is a great difference, between "offering, that a man may do more than is "commanded; and that, he may do something "which is not commanded; The former suppo-"ses him to have done all commanded, the se-"cond may be true, though in most, or all "other things, he have been wanting: Hee "asserts the second, not the first. But is not this

this *new diſtinction*, ſometimes *coincident*? For he that doth *ſomewhat not commanded*; does alſo ſomething *more*, than is commanded; though hee hath not in other things, done all that is commanded; and ſo to doe *more* than is commanded, does not ſuppoſe, he hath done *all* that is commanded, nor doe the *Romaniſts* ſuppoſe that, to their *ſupererogation*: ſo this is nothing.

2. He addes therefore; "*That to ſupererogate ſuppoſeth one of theſe two things*, 1. "*either that the perſon ſpoken of, hath paid God all that is due to him, by way of perfect obedience*, i. e. *hath never ſinned*; *or* "2. *that having ſinned, and ſo become a debtor, he hath paid that debt, by ſatisfaction, by doing ſomething elſe, which may ſatisfie God, for his ſin*, &c.

But the firſt of theſe, is juſt the *ſame* with the former, that by *doing more* than was commanded, was ſuppoſed, hee had *done all* that was commanded, *i. e.* had *never ſinned*; which himſelfe ſaies, the *Romaniſts* do not own. It muſt then lye all upon the *ſecond*, that though he have *ſinned*, yet he may *ſatisfie* God ſo for his ſinne, by *ſome other work not commanded* (for *duties* pay no *Debts*, much leſſe *ſupererogate*) not onely for *himſelf*, but alſo for *others*, *ex abundanti*, &c. Now ſaies the Doctor; from both theſe, the *preſent Doctrine* is free: For the firſt, its true, the

Dr.

Doctor does not say, that the *person never sinned*; or hath *perfect* obedience; but yet this he saies, (with the *Romanists*) that hee may doe *something not commanded*, that is (say *I*) something *more* than is commanded, which sounds ill, in an *Orthodox* eare; and yet this is that, which the Doctor hath been *labouring* to prove for many *sections* together. As for the second, the Doctor *disclaimes* the Doctrine of *satisfaction*, and so consequently, (so farre) that of *Supererogation*: But yet cannot free his doctrine from some kind of *Supererogation*. For, works of *Supererogation*, have not their *denomination*, from *satisfaction* made by them; but they are therefore thought to be *satisfactions*, because, they doe *something more* than the Law required; *Supererogare*, is as much, as, *super quod erogavit lex*: Yea in many respects such *works* may be said to *Supererogate*.

First, with respect to the *Law* it self, when men think they have done *more* than the Law required, which makes them not *Supererogatorie*, but *Derogatory*, from the *perfection* of the *Law* of God, and layes *imperfection* upon it, (as the Doctor hath *plainly* done above.) 2. With respect had to *other* men, men, who attain not to that *perfection* (as they call it) to do *something more* than commanded; as that *Pharisee*, that said (with scorne and pride enough) "*I am not as other men,*

*men, I fast twice a week.* And this was the note of *discrimination*, between the *Hasidæj*, and the *Hareæj*, as we heard above. 3. With respect to the *over-pleasing* and *acceptance* of God: They that think that they can doe *something not commanded*, do think, and expect to find *more*, and greater *acceptance* from God, than they themselves or others do, for doing onely *what is commanded*: *Papists* do indeed, think they can *merit* with God by such works, for *themselves* and *others*: Ours are not come so far yet, but they do think to find (or procure) *more acceptance* for their *voluntary oblations* here, and if not *glory* it self, yet a greater *reward*, and *greater glory* hereafter for such works. For more *acceptance* the Doctor speakes expresly; *Sect.* 16. "*When in the service of God, a man out of a* "*pious affection shall do any thing else, beside* "*what God hath commanded, by any par-* "*ticular precept, this action of his, is ac-* "*counted so much more commendable to God.* And elsewhere, "*The more voluntary the* "*service, the more acceptable.* What exceptions may be made to this, see above at *Sect.* 16. and adde, If the Doctor should meane it of *voluntarinesse* in a *prescribed* worship of God, it is not to the purpose; for even the *highest voluntarinesse*, is there required. If he mean it of a *voluntary, wil devised* worship, I have said, and say again, "*The more volun-*

"tary, the more abhominable. As for the o-
ther, that by their *voluntary oblations*, they
do thinke and expect to finde *greater glory*,
and *reward* hereafter, the Doctor is not so
expresse; Yet when he makes it "*a part of*
"*prudence, to aspire to the most perfect state,*
"*that is, (as he implyes) Martyrdome, for*
"*his reason, because that is the way and*
*means, to advance us higheſt in glory*; Sect.
"43, 44. *Knowing the greateſt perfection,*
"*to be most gloriously rewarded*; he comes
very near to think, that *voluntary oblations*,
such as voluntary *Martyrdome*, may procure,
*greater reward*, than commanded worshp.
To draw to a conclusion of all; when the
Doctor saies, "*His Doctrine forbiddeth any*
"*the most justified man, to pretend to-*
"*ward satisfying for others, but to work*
"*out his own salvation, with fear and tremb-*
"*ling*, i. e. *with all the Humility in the*
"*world*. This may be *true* in the *Doctrine*;
but in the *Practise*, I fear it tends to *pride*, and
*scorne*, to teach men, "*That to do things not*
"*commanded, will make a man more accep-*
"*table to God, and purchase him a greater*
"*measure of glory hereafter, than to do things*
"*onely commanded by God*: Wee have too
much *experience* of the *succesſe*, of such
*Doctrine*, not onely in the old *Hasidaj*, and
later *Pharisees*, but palpably in the *Church*
of *Rome*, at this day; and our own late Su-
perstiti-

tious *Willworshipers*, and *Formalists*, who did *overlooke* others ( who like the *Kareans*, kept close to the *Rule* of the word, for their *worship* ) with abundance of *contempt* and *insolence*; as all that knew the *times*, can sufficiently testifie.

*FINIS.*

# EXERCITATION
## THE THIRD,
## OF
## The FESTIVALS of the CHURCH.
### And particularly of
# CHRISTMAS.

By *D. C.*

---

Gal. 4. 9, 10.

*But now after you have known God, or rather, are known of God, how turn you again to the weak and beggerly elements whereunto yee desire again to be in bondage?*

*You observe dayes, and months, and times, and years.*

*Cypr. Epist. 73.*

Frustra nobis, qui ratione vincimur, consuetudinem opponunt.

---

*LONDON*,
Printed for *J. Wright* at the sign of the *Kings-head* in the Oldbayley, 1653.

# OF *CHRISTMAS*, AND other FESTIVALS of the CHURCH.

## Section 1.

IT is true indeed, that when the *Apostle* sayes, 1 *Cor.* 11. 16. *If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God.* From hence may bee made, 1. *Negatively*; we, or the *Churches* have no such *custome*: *ergo* they are *contentious* that would induce any new practise into the Church. 2. *Affirmatively*, we *Apostles*, and the Churches of Christ have such a custome; *ergo* they are contentious that oppose, or reject it. But the force of the consequence is far stronger in the *Negative* (which is the inference of that Text) than in the *Affirmative*, unlesse some other considerations be put in: For example, the *Apostolical* Church had no such custome as the *Sacrifice* of the Mass, *praying* for, or to the dead, *worshiping of* Images, *&c.* *ergo* they are *contentious* and *superstitious* who bring them into the Church: On the other side, it will not follow the *Apostolical* Church had a custome, to observe the

*Sab-*

*hath* of the Jews (when they came amongst them) to *circumcise*, sometimes to *abstain* from blood, &c. to avoyd offence, and winne the Jews; *ergo* they that go about afterwards to *lay down* these, are contentious; this will no wayes be admitted. The reason is, because the *Apostles* afterwards repealed those *Jewish* customes. Two cautions therefore must be added to make the *Affirmative* constringent.

1. That the *custome* which is pleaded for, be brought into the Church by the *Apostles* themselves, for Gospel worship: For he saies, "*We* (*we*) *have no such custome, nor the* "*Churches of God.* The Gospel *Churches* by us planted.

2. That the *custome* pleaded be grounded *truly* (if not so clearly) upon the Word of God: For this is no good argument against a rational Disputant. "*The present Church* ("*of* Rome, *suppose, or any Church, some* "*centuries, or more of years after the Apo-* "*stles*) *hath such or such a custom*; ergo *we* "*must receive it, unless we will be counted con-* "*tentious.* But this is thought a good inference: "*The Apostolicall purest Church had* "*a custom to observe the Lords day, the first* "*day of the week*, Act. 20. 7. 1 Cor. 16. 1, 2. "*instead of the old Sabbath*; ergo *that day* "*was instituted by the Apostles, and they that* "*reject it, or prophane it, are more then con-* "*tentious, even sacrilegious.* And upon these con-

siderations the Doctor hath consulted ill to his own cause, to produce this Text for his *Festivall*: For hee dare not say it was instituted by the *Apostles*, nor can prove it was observed by the *prime*, and *purest* Church (though he oft assert it) then the inference is strong against him. "*The Apostle, & prime* "*Apostolicall Church had no such custom as* "*the observation of Christmas*; ergo *they are* "*contentious who plead for its continuance.* It matters not then what the ancient usage of the Church of *England* hath been; if it began not with the *Apostles* in the first Churches: Which, of the Feast of *Christs Nativitie*, cannot, I think, be proved; I am sure is not performed by the learned Doctor. Nor yet that the *Church* of *England* was extant in the *Apostles* times; or if it were, that this *custome* of *Christmas* was from the beginning of the *plantation* of the Gospell amongst us, which yet he undertakes to manifest.

§. 2. The latter he first begins with: And that it is thus *ancient* he will prove, "*By one* "*objection against*, viz. *the retaining of some* "*heathen usages, in the observation of it*, "*which are undeniable Testimonies of the An-* "*tiquity and uninterrupted continuance of* "*this practise, even from the time of our first* "*conversion: For otherwise, it is not imagi-* "*nable how any heathen usage should be found*

"*ad-*

"*adherent to it.* But this is no way constringent: For they might bee added (together with the *Festival* it self) some good while after the first *conversion*, of some part of this *Island*, the better to winne the rest to a liking of Christian Religion, by conforming to them in celebration of *Festivals*; as the like was done to winne the Jewes in observing the old *Sabbath*, *Pentecost*, &c. "*The Apostles* (saies the Doctor) *to attract the Jews to the* Sect. 71. "*Christian Religion, did gratifie them in re-*
"*taining many of their customs.* That was "for a time, bnt after cast them off. And this Festivall being substituted instead of the old *Saturnalia*, in the same Month (as is confessed by many, and the Doctor himselfe) no mar- Sect. 63. vaile if some *heathen usages* stuck close to it, and could not since be gotten out: For those *heathen usages* continued by the *ruder multitude* (and others too) though they have been "*no part of the office of the Feast*, yet doe they fully hold out these two things;

1. "*How easie a thing it is for such ill u-*
"*sage, to creep into humane Ordinances.*

2. "*How hard it is, to get them out, when*
"*once got in, being ready to plead prescripti-*
"*on.* Seeing after so long a time as fifteen, or sixteen hundred yeares continuance (as the Dr. thinks they still attend the *Festival*; people being more tenacious of customs, *received* 1 Pet. 1. 18 *by the Tradition of their Fathers*, then of the very *Institutions* of God. §. 3. 4.

§. 34. For the *former*, that the *conversion* of *England* was early, is very likely, but not so early, as is pretended, but not proved: For as the *Histories* and *Monuments* are very obscure and doubtfull, differing much one from another; so the Doctor himself is very *uncertain*, where to place the beginning, or who was the *Instrument* of our conversion. "*It may* "*be believed, either Apostolical, or very near* "*the Apostles times.* Faine would hee have us think it was by some *Apostle*, if he knew how to make it out. Some affirm it was *Simon Zelotes*, Sect. 6. "*And there was some* "*colour for the affirmation of* Simon Meta-"phrastes; *That St.* Peter *stayed in* Britain: "*sometime, converted many, and constituted* "*Churches, & ordained Bishops in the twelfth* "*year of* Nero's *reign.* But he slurs his Author thus: "*The authority of this Writer is* "*not great.* He might have said, *Nothing worth*, being contradicted by so many others, and by the Doctor himself, by and by. Yet it might be near the *Apostles* times by some *Apostolicall men*; some say "*rather by* Jo-"seph *of* Arimathea; for so Mr. *Camden* reports (from as ancient Records, and credible as any we have; for we have none very ancient or very credible, "*That* Joseph *of* Arima-"thea *planted Christianity here coming out* "*of* France. Belike *Crescens* sent him hither to convert the *Britains*; if he did not come,

and

and doe it himself: For so the Doctor would have it, and proves it out of Scripture, 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. *Crescens* (*sent by* St. Paul *was gone into* Galatia; where *Galatia* may signifie *France*, as some Authors take it, and the Doctor is willing to beleeve it: For presently (though others contradict) hee takes it for granted, when he sayes, "*What is so early affirmed in* "*Scripture of the communicating of the Go-* "*spell to* France (*i. e. by* Crescens) *which* "*is so near to us, removes all improbabilitie* "*from those Histories which record the plan-* "*tation of the Gospel in these Islands in the* "*Apostles times.* Its easie to beleeve, that *Crescens*, if he were in *France*, might quickly step over into *England*, but the former is yet to prove: For the Doctor knows very well, that very learned men deny, that *Galatia* was there taken for *France*; but for a part of *Asia*, which is far enough from *England*. Yea they demonstrate it (as they think) that it was not meant of *France*; for which I referre him to *Estius* on the place, 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. However, whether *Crescens* were ever in *France* or no, sure he was not in *England* to convert the Nation. Hear the Doctors own words: "*This* (which he had said before) "*is an evidence,* "*that neither* Peter *nor* Paul, *nor* Crescens, *nor* "*any of those that usually accompanied either* "*of those two Apostles, did bring the Christian* "*Faith to this Island.* He might have added,

"*Nor*

"*Nor* Joseph *of* Arimathea, *nor* Simon Ze-"lotes, upon the reason there by him given. The Affirmation of *Gildas*, that this was in *Tiberius*'s Raign, was meer Tradition, and farre from probability: For then *England* should be converted, within four yeares after Christs death; In the 18. of *Tiberius*, our Lord suffered, and *Tiberius* raigned but 22. in all: No *Authors* of any credit, lay it so high. As for *Tertullian* and *Origen*; they lived both in the *third Centurie*, above 200. years after Christ, And its very likely, *Christianity* was planted here, in some parts, some time before them. But its very observable, that neither of those *Antients*, nor any before them, in all their writings, ever mention the *Feast* of the *Nativity*, as then in observation, though they often speake of other *usages* of the Church, before, and in their times. The most probable opinion is, that, though some persons, of this, as of most Nations, were converted early to the *Faith*, yet the *Nation*, or any considerable part of it, was not converted till *King Lucius* his time, (about the yeare of Christ, 180.) the first *Christian King*, in the whole world, (which is a great *honour* to our Nation.) This was done (say *Historians*) in the time of *Eleutherius*, then Bishop of *Rome*, who lived towards the end of the second *Centurie*. And his Epistle to King *Lucius* (if that

Sir *Henr. Spilm. concil. Brit. p.* 16.

be *Authentick*, for the Doctor doubts it, and well he may, if hee do but remember what a learned *Historian* saies) doth not say, that *Britain*, had *long ago* (before *Lucius* his time) received the Faith, but rather, *nuper*, *lately*; and so it was in the *Latine*, in the Doctors Margine, but wisely left out in the *English*; which why it was done, let others judge. *Historians* say, that King *Lucius*, desired of *Eleutherius*, that he and his people, might have some sent to *baptize* them; who accordingly, sent *Fugatius* and *Damianus*. Now if *Christianity*, had been planted here from the Apostles times, or by Apostolicall men, its not probable, that they left no *Presbyters* here to baptize, but that they must send to *Rome* for such: which would give *Romanists* a fairer *plea*, to subject *England* to *Rome*; then that of *Augustine* the Monke; which the Doctor disputes so much against hereafter.

§. 5. *Diocletians* persecution, falls in the beginning of the fourth *Century*, after Christ, before which time, wee hear of *Christianity* planted here; and it may be, the *Feast of the Nativity* was set up, in some Churches, before this time; but not *universally* in all, "*till about* 400. *years after Christ*, (as wee shall hear the Doctor confesse, before we have done) though he pleads hard, to prove it a *custome* of the Church, in all ages: And this

may

may serve anon, to answer that which will be produced, for the *Festivitie*, that *Diocletian* slew 20000 Christians assembled together, on that day: though the *Author* of that report, is of no great credit.

§. 6. "*The celebration of* Easter, *by the* "*antient British Churches, contrary to the* "*customs of the Western Churches* will give little light, to the maine question, concerning the first *Plantation* of the Gospell here, by the Apostles, *&c.* or the *Antiquity* of the Festivall, pleaded for. It may indeed argue, that *England* did not receive *Christianity* first from *Rome*, in *Augustines* times; but does not prove, that those that planted *Christianity* here, "*were such as in the A-* "*postolicall times, kept their Easter after the Jewish manner.* For the *Eastern* Christians commonly kept it so, but not in the Apostles times. Which the Doctor takes for granted; but is denyed him: and that upon these Reasons.

1. There is no mention of either the *Institution*, or observation of it, in Scripture, nor any *ground* to found it upon. The Apostles did take *advantage* of that, and the like *Solemnities*, to preach to the Jewes, to convert them, (as was said afore) but so farre were they from *Institution* of them, as *Christian Feasts*, that they do expresly *repeal* them, and cry them down.

Lib. 5. c. 22.

2. *Socrates* the *Historian* saies, "*The Apostles were not sollicitous, to appoint any "Festivall daies at all*, then not this of *Easter*.

See Lo *Falk.* reply. p. 99.

3. The *difference* of the observation of it, in the *Eastern*, and *Western* Churches, makes it evident it was not *Instituted* by the Apostles: for then it would be *uniformly* observed in all places. And as for the *Authority* of the succeeding Church, in such matters, we shall meet with it anon, yet this we say, at present, that the observation of *Easter*, hath better *Antiquity*, than this of *Christmas*, though not Apostolicall.

§. 7. But the Doctor hath found one *Evidence* of moment; "*Christmas day is called "in our old* Monument, *Midwinter day*; "*whence it may reasonably be concluded*, "*that when that name was first applyed "to that day*, *Christmas day* was *in the Ca-"lendar, either coincident with, or not far re-"moved, from the Winter Solstice: and wee "continue to call the* 24. *of* June, Midsomer "*day, half a year from the* 25th *of* December.

How sweetly all agree? *John Baptist* was conceived, six months before *our Lord*, and and so born six months before him: Hence the *Feastmasters*, plead his birth on the 24. of *June*, and his, and our Lords on the 25. of *December*.

1. But

1. But I would be satisfied, which is the *Older Festivall*, that of *John*, or this of *Christ*? Its observed by *Chemnitius*, that the *Feast* of the *Nativity*, was not heard of, in the most *antient Church*; till towards the 400. year; but no mention of the *Feast* of *Iohn Baptist* till towards the 800. year; Or it may be they were both appointed about the same time: upon supposition then by the *Western* Church, that our Saviour was borne on the 25. of *December* (as the Doctor saies) and the *Feast* of *Nativity* setled upon that day, either they or some others, placed the *Feast* of *Iohn Baptist* on the 24. of *Iune*; that all might correspond.

2. If the names of *Midwinter* day, and *Midsommer* day, were so called here, while the *Island* was Heathen, they were far more antient, than *Christmas* Day: and then, *Christmas* day, was rather applyed to *Midwinter* day, than *Midwinter* day, to *Christmas* day: but however it was, it followes not (as the Doctor would have it) "*that it must be* "*soon after our Saviours times, that this day* "*was capable of that appellation, and con-*"*sequently that the day was here celebrated* "*so early.* For it might be, a *good while* after, so called, when the *Island* was first converted, which was not, (as we have discourssed) till towards the end of the second *Century.*

3. It is confessed by the Doctor, "*that* "*Midwinter day is a fortnight sooner than* "*our Christmas day; the solstice being about* "*the* 11. *of* December. Then say I, they kept not *Christmas* day, on *Midwinter* day; for thats a fortnight sooner: So wee keep it not on the same day, with our first *converts*, nor yet on the day, that the *Western* Church now keep it, who keep it *stilo novo*, 10. daies before us: Which *difference* of observation, (as was said of *Easter*) argues it, not to be *Apostolicall*, nor *soon after our Saviours daies* (as the Doctor saies.) For if they had instituted such a *Feast* to the honour of our *Saviour*, they would all have agreed upon the *same day*, in all places, as they did, in observation of the *Lords day*, for our *Christian* Sabbath.

§. 8. Upon those his premises, he drawes out two *Corolaries* or *Characters*, set upon this, or any other *Christian Solemnity*, *Easter*, *Pentecost*, &c. of *immemoriall* usage, in this Nation. "*First that the antiquity of it*, "*doth no way argue, that it hath any thing* "*of the corruptions of the Roman See, ad-* "*hering to it, but the contrary.* To which we have partly spoken afore; and now adde; that as the observation of *Easter* differently from the *Western* Church, doth argue, that wee received not our *Christianity* from *Rome*; so the Antiquity of the observation

of

of *Christmas*, and some other Festivalls (suppose in the third or fourth *Century*) may also argue, that they have nothing of the corruption of the *Roman See*, (we mean, since it was judged *Antichristian*, about the yeare 600.) adhering to them: But yet may have too much of the *Corruption* of those Churches, wherein they were first invented; *Corruption* (we say) which crept into those *Churches*, not long after the *Apostles* daies. It's known to all, that read the *Histories* of the Church, how many *Innovations* and *Superstitions* were crept into the Church, long before *Rome* began to be *Babilon*; And *Romish* Religion, is a *bundle* of most of those Corruptions.

§. 9. But for the second inference, "*That* "*any such antient usage of this particular* "*Church, if it had no other ground to stand* "*on* (*as its foundation*) *or concurrence of all* "*other Churches* (*as pillars*) *to sustaine it*, "*were a very competent Authority for the* "*continuance of such a practice in this* "*Kingdome.* Wee shall take leave to *demur* a little upon this. For grant (as wee may) that this *Anglicane*, or *British* Church be very *antient*, by its foundation, and αὐτοκέφαλος, for its *authority*, as subordinate to no Forrain *Patriarch*, yet we justly question, (though the Doctor doe not) whither it be "*invest-*"*ed with such an unquestionable power* to in-

stitute what *Ceremonies* it please, which may not upon good reasons, be *changed* and abolished. It is known sufficiently, that many *antient Customes*, and *Ceremonies* (as antient perhaps as his *Christmas*) instituted, or taken up, by this, and the concurrence of many, if not most *Churches*, have "*without temeritie* been altered, and abolished: and others may and must, when they be abused to *Superstition* and prophaness, (as this *Feast* will appear to have been.) It will not be amiss, here briefly to consider, what that "*unquestionable power of this or any Church is*, "*to constitute Ceremonies for its selfe*, (as "*it shall judge most useful, most for edification, and most agreeable to the Analogie of faith*) *which consequently may not, without great temerity, be changed and abolished by any.* And then, whither this *Feast* be a *Ceremonie* of that nature.

For the first, "*the Authority of the Church, to constitute Ceremonies for its selfe*; it is not justly called, *unquestionable*; for it hath for many years past, beene the *apple* of contention, between the *Prelates* and the *Non-conformists*: But before we debate it, we desire to know, and be satisfied in two things.

1. What he meanes by the *Church*, whither 1. the *Universall Church*, for he *often* speakes of that. *Sect.* 12. 45. *&c.* and charges

ges us "*with seperation and Schism, for de-*
"*parture from the Universall Church.* If so, I would say two things; First that the *Universall Church*, of the first ages (or since) *never met* to institute any *Ceremonies*, for all Churches, nor in speciall, for this of *Christmas*. Secondly, if they had met, yet that *Church*, had no *power*, to bind after Churches, (if they met) if they saw cause to abolish them; for a reason anon to be given. But 2. if he take it of a *particular Church*, (as this of *England*: as here he doth) then I say again; 1. We read of no such *Cannons* made by the *Church*, at the first conversion, to make the *usage* so antient, and to bind all her Children, in after ages. 2. If we did find such, yet the *Succeeding Church*, having the same *Power*, may annull if she see cause, what was by them instituted.

2. We desire also to know what he means, by *Ceremonies*, for this is an *ambiguous* word, under which the *Romanists* do shroud their *Superstitious Will-worship*: *Ceremonies* then, are of two sorts. 1. Meere *Circumstances* of commanded Worship, for the more *orderly* and *decent* performance of it: Or 2. *Parts of Worship*, as the *Iewish Ceremonies* for certain, were. If the Doctor mean it, in the latter sense (as I think he does) wee must again distinguish of such *Ceremonies*, they are either *dumbe* and *non-significant*,

as

as the Church of *Rome* hath many, or *Significant*, and that either, by *Nature*, or by *Institution*: If *significant* by institution, then either by *Divine*, or *Humane* Institution. These Distinctions being premised, wee suppose the Doctor, does not meane of the *Ceremoniall circumstances*, or *Adjuncts* of commanded worship, for that will not stand him in any stead; nor does any man *deny* the Church a Power to order those. But he must meane it, of *Ceremoniall Worship*, as opposed to *Moral*; And that not, for *Dumbe* or Non-significant Ceremonies: those he dislikes, in the *Church* of *Rome*; but for *Significant* Ceremonies; not significant by *Nature*, those need no Institution; but by *Institution*, not *Divine*, (that were little lesse than a contradiction) but *Humane* Institution. Then the question is this, "*Whither the Church, Universall for all Churches; or a particular* "*Church, for her own members, have an unquestionable Authority to institute Significant Ceremonies, as parts of worship, which* "*may not, upon just reasons, be changed, or* "*abolished.* This was the *Question* to be proved; but is onely taken for granted; in these particulars, by the Dr.

1. That the *Church* whether *Universall*, or particular hath such a power to institute *Ceremonies*, (unlesse they be such as tend to *Euxaxy*, and *Decencie*, and the preservation or fur-

furtherance of Gods *commanded* worship) what and how many she please, "*as she shall* "*judge most usefull, most for edification*, &c. as the Doctor saies; but goes not about to prove, but takes it as *unquestionable*. This we do deny, and wee thinke upon good reasons, (besides the judgement of *Reformed* Churches;) If the *Church* be allowed such a power, the mischiefes will be many. As.

1. Its *prejudicious* to the *simplicity* of Gospell-worship. 2 *Cor.* 11. 3. "*the simplicity* "*which is in Christ*. That is, in the Gospell of Christ. It was spoken with respect to the *false Apostles*, who by their *πιθανολογία*, *subtle perswasive* words, did corrupt both the *Doctrine* and *Worship* of the Gospell; as may appear by comparing this place, with *Col.* 2. The *Worship* of the *Law*, was for the most part, *Ceremoniall*, in externall *pompe* and services: But the *Worship* of the Gospel, is lesse *ceremonious*, and *gaudie*, and more *spirituall*; *Joh.* 4. "*in spirit and truth*, opposed to those *ceremoniall*, typicall, *shadowes* and *figures* of the Legall worship. The *Gospel Worship* is for the most part *morall*, praying, preaching, hearing, *&c.* without any thing like to that *ceremoniall* worship, except the *observation* of the *Lords day*, and the two *Sacraments*, designed and instituted by *Christ* himself, or by his Commission: But if the *Church*

Ceremonies burthenous in the number, might turn it into evill Will-worship. *Sect.* 25.

*Church* have a power to institute *cermoniall* Worshipp, she may bring us back to a *Legall* worshipp, equall with the Jewes: as the *Church* of *Rome* hath done.

2. If the Church have any such power, to *institute* Ceremonies; they must be either *Non-significant* ones, but those *Protestants* disclaim as *idle fooleries*: or *significant*; and then, either by *nature*, or *Institution*; Those of *nature*, need no *Institution*; If *Institution* be pleaded, it must be either *Divine*, but the *Church* hath nothing to do with them, they are instituted to her hands: Or *Humane*, but thats expressly against the second Commandement; as hath been said elsewhere. "*God* "*onely can prescribe his own worshipp.* Hence it was, that those *Traditions* of worshipp, introduced by the *false teachers*, are coudemned, because they were "*the Doctrines and* "*commandements of men.* Col. 2. 22. which when our *Divines* urge against such kind of *ceremoniall* worshipp, in the *Church* of *Rome*, as *Humane* Institutions, they have no way to avoid it, but to say; "*Ceremonies institu-* "*ted by an humane spirit*, (*as ours are*) "*are there condemned, but theirs are institu-* "*ted by the holy Ghost joyning with their* "*Pastors, in the Regiment of the Church*, as the *Rhemists* speak, on *Math.* 15. 9. and others more. And therefore *Papists* may better plead their *binding power*, than ours can doe.

*Vide Estium & Corne l. A lapide in locum.*

do. I shall adde to this, That to institute *significant ceremonies*, as a part of *Worship*, is a *superstitious* excesse, and so *Wil-worship*, which I prove from the Doctors own Concessions: "*To put more virtue and efficacie into things,* "*then either naturally, or by the Rule of Gods* "*Word is in them, is a nimiety*, & so Superstition; but for men to institute significant *ceremonies*, for *edification*, to *teach*, and *instruct*, &c. is to put more *virtue* and *efficacy* in them then naturally, or by the *Rule* of the Word, (that is, Divine Institution) God put in them; *ergo*. The *Major* is the Doctors own; the *Minor* is evident: They have it not by Nature; nor by divine Institution (then they needed not humane Institution) *ergo*, it is *superstitious*; and consequently the Church hath no such power. Of Superstition, *sect.* 45.

3. Grant her but such *power*, and there will be no end of *Ceremonies*; no man can tell where she will stay, unlesse some *bounds* be prescribed in Scripture. The Doctors qualifications, "*That they be few and wholsome*, have no ground to rest on. For who shall judge of the *number* or *unwholsomnes*, without a Rule? Not any *private* man, that's denyed, and very reasonably. Not a *particular Church*; the Universall may judge *otherwise*. Not the *Universall* Church of one Age; for the next Generation may be wiser, and thinke them *too few*, or *too many*; not *wholsom*, or Of Superstit. *sect* 38

un-

unwholsom, and so may either multiply, or annul them. See more of this in the Discourse of *Superstition*, Sect. 32. 33. Upon this ground grow all those, more then *Jewish ceremonies* of the *Romish* Church. That of the first.

2. The Doctor takes for *granted* also, that the Church hath power to institute *Holy daies* (such as *Christmas*) and to make them equall with the *Lords day*: For of this he is speaking, while he gives the Church this *unquestionable* power, but he cannot but know this is denyed by many Divines.

3. He also takes as *yeelded*, That there is some *ancient* Institution of this Church for his *Christmas*, from our first conversion; which must be the ground for it to stand on, and "*a competent Authoritie for the continuance of such a practise in this Kingdome*; but this he hath not proved.

4. Once more, he takes as granted; "*That* "*such ceremonies, or Festivals established by* "*a Church, may not, without great temerity* "*be changed, or abolished by any.* What? not by the Universall Church? not by the succeeding Church? That were to make the Laws of a particular Church, like those of the *Medes* and *Persians*, unchangeable, and equall with the Laws of God. Or else to *cut short* the succeeding Church from the same *priviledge* of the former; and so in time the Church may lose all power to institute

That we are to restrain our liberty, and to exchange one burthen for another. So the Dr. of Superstition sect. 56.

tute *New* ceremonies; or else ceremonies may be multiplyed to the end of the world. And so much of the first, the *Authority* of the Church, to institute Ceremonies. A word of the next.

Secondly, we must enquire, whether if the Church have any power to ordain any *Ceremonies*, this of *Christmas*, be such, as she may ordain. We have said, and say again, to institute *Holy daies*, and to make them *parts of Geds worship*, is a *priviledge* of God alone. If now the Doctor shall say, The Church institutes this *Festival* onely as a *circumstance*, or Adjunct of *Worship* commanded, it will bee little to his purpose, and makes it no more *holy*, than any other day, when the same *worship* is performed. But its evident, that in the Church of *Rome*, this, and other *Festivals* are not counted *meer Ceremonies* in that sense; but as *parts* of Divine Worship, and so observed, with greater *solemnities*, and more *Ceremonies* than the *Lords day* it self; which is both *superstitious* and *sacrilegious*. And thus it hath been with some, yea many of our Prelatical and Cathedral men, esteemed and observed, not onely as *equally* holy with the *Lords day*, but with more solemn services, with more *abstinencie* from labour and recreations; as we shall hear our Doctor confesse anon. We now consider what he sayes to prove the *disusing of these Feasts blameable.*

§. 10.

§. 10. "*These are part of that establish-*
"*ment which the Reformation in this King-*
"*dom hath enacted for us by act of Parlia-*
"*ment.* To this we say;

1. The *Reformation* formerly made in this Kingdome, we have good cause to blesse God for; but we know it was not so *full* and *perfect* as the Reformers themselves could have wished, by reason of the times, *new* come out of the darknesse of *Popery*, and the *tenaciousnesse* of old *customs*, received by *tradition* of their Fathers.

2. This seems to grant that the *Reformation*, and so the establishment of these *Festivals* in this Nation, was made by the *State*, and not by the *Church*, which now is pleaded for.

§. 11. Secondly, "*This, & other Feasts of*
"*Christ, are in the Reformed, especially the*
"Lutheran *Churches, still retained, and where*
"*they are taken away in some Churches, by*
"*some sober members wished for.* We answer to this; The Churches that retain these *Feasts* (especially the *Lutherans*) are not reputed the best Reformed Churches, nor by the Doctor himself (I beleeve) thought fit to be compared with *England*, & some other Churches in Doctrine and Worship, and so no fit presidents for our Reformation. What private persons wish or say, is not much to be regarded; unlesse their reasons bee constringent. However, we are not alone, nor the first in this

this *dis-usage* of this Festivall: Some *Protestant* Reformed Churches, are with us, and afore us. As for the *Sermons* given to *Christmas* day, by some that now disuse it (wherin "*The* "*whole body of their publick devotions*, is falsely said, now to consist, their prayers being as good, and as large as the *Liturgies*) it will afford him no more succour, than this; That the *Authority* then in being, commanding *Vacation* from work, they onely took the *opportunity* to preach, to prevent *disorders* in their people, which attend such *Festivities*; And the *Authority* now in force, prohibiting, they doe forbear to preach.

§. 12. 3. The laying down, or *disusing* the observation of this Festivity, "*is not an act of* "*Division or separation, from either the* "*particular Church of* England, *or from the* "*Universall Church in all ages, especi-* "*ally that of the first and purest times*: Not the *latter* for certain; for we have proved afore, the first and *purest ages* of the Church, did not observe it. Not the former, unlesse he will yeeld, that the *Reformation* of the Church of *England*, in former times, was a *Division* or separation from the Church of *Rome*; or the Reformation in *Luthers* time, was a division and separation from the *Catholick* Church, as Papists say it was.

§. 13. 4. If *Superstition* and *profaneſs* may be ground sufficient to lay aside a Custome;

the *complexion* of the *times* have long since invited to the laying aside the usage of this *Feast*. His pretences to the contrary, are insufficient.

1. "*The omission of Christmas sermons* "*and services, tends not to raze out of the* "*minds of the ignorant sort, the slender* "*knowledge they have of the birth of Christ,* "*and consequent mysteries of Religion*" For the *Gospell* being read and preached on, all the year long; they cannot but often hear of the *Birth, Life, Death, Buriall,* and resurrection of Christ. The *Knowledge* which the ignorant people learned by some mens *Christmas* Act 25: *Sermons,* was slender indeed, nothing but a *Superficiall* ( as he ) *Notionall,* carnall knowledge of one *Jesus* ( as that *Roman* Deputie spake ) that was borne at that time, to give men *liberty* to *Feast*, & be merry.

2. This cannot ( as he charges it ) "*gra-* "*tifie their worldly affections, and assist A-* "*theism, &c.* but rather to keep it ( as usually they did ) in all *Festivall* delights, ( like the *Revells* of *Bacchus* ) did both mote *gratifie* their Worldly lusts, and tended to *Atheism,* and profanesse.

3. The *Casuists* ( whose great reason hee seemes to applaud ) affirming, that "*the ne-* "*cessaries of beleefe, for the vulgar sort are* "*no more than the great Holy dayes of the* "*year,* spake with as much, that is, as *little*

*tle reason*, as their fellowes the *Jesuits*, who say and affirm, that "*Images are the* "*best laymens-books instead of the Scrip-* "*tures.*

4. The *ejecting* of these *Holydaies* out of the Church, will not any with "*dispatch the* "*opinion of any necessity of beleeving the* "*Articles of faith*; (the *Creed* being still to be retained, in and with the *Catechisme*) for the *Ministers* preaching constantly of those *Truths*, may helpe not onely *in some degree* (as he) bnt very much, and more, than the great *Holydaies* of themselves can doe. And why not *abundantly* sufficient as it was, in the first *planting* of Churches, before these *Festivalls* were invented? We have had enough *experience*, that in those places (*Cathedrall Cities*) where those *Festivalls* have been most *punctually* and solemnly observed (taking in there *Chrystmas Sermons* too) there have been found, lesse *saving knowledge* of Christ, more *Superstition*, and more *Prophanesse*, than in any Country *Villages*, where the *Gospell* hath been sinceerely preached.

§. 14. "*The* Impatience *of sound Doctrine*, "*and readinesse to embrace what ever is novel* is not to be found in those of *deeper*, sound knowledge; but in the *ungrounded* professors o fformer times, made *formal Christians* by external *Ceremonies*, & outward *Pomp* of ser-

vice: But those that endeavoured to *Reforme* the abuses of *Superstition* and *prophanesse*, are the men onely, or chiefly, that propugne and maintain sound Doctrine; whereas those that were the greatest *favourers* of those *Festivities*, some of them, either are fallen into the propagating of error, *Arminianism*, *&c.* or at least doe little appeare to maintain the truth

As for "*Hospitality and charity at those* "*times*, its observable in many strong *pleaders* for *Christmas*, that they are willing enough to abate the *charge* of the Feast, both then, and all the year after; yet no body hinders them from being *Hospitable* and Charitable.

§.15.5. "*What ever specious design was in* "*the first institutors* of this piece of *Service* to Jesus Christ (as after it is called) it matters not much. *Gideons* design, in making a Golden *Ephod*, was very fair, to leave a Monument of his Victory, "*as a pious pub-* "*lik acknowledgement of his thankfullnesse*, yet it proved a *snare*, to him and his house & to all *Israel*. Many of the *Superstitions* of the *now* Church of *Rome*, had no doubt a *pious design*, and a *shew* of wisdome, but the issue hath been very mischeivous: Even so, it hath happened to this *Institution* now in hand.

§. 16. There may indeed a threefold *guilt* and *danger* be charged upon the *Institution* and continuance of this *observance*; "1. *Of Will-*

*Will-worship because it is not commanded in* "*scriptures. 2. of Superstition, in observing* "*dates, 3. Of Riot frequent in such Festi-* "*valls.* The two former, (he saies) he hath spoken to else where, *viz.* "*both in his Trea-* "*tises of Will-worship and Superstition, and* "*also in his practicall Catechisme*: In the two former, though something be said in generall, or in *thesi*, yet nothing, that I observe, in speciall, or in *hypothesi*, of this *Festivall*. Indeed in his *practicall Catechisme*, hee hath undertaken the *vindication* of it, from all these three charges, but more largely, the two *first* there; and here more of the last, that of *Riot*; we shall consider what he saies, in order.

First to free the *Festivall*, from the charge of *Willworship*, he proceeds two waies.

1. "*In respect of those, who retain the u-* "*sage of it, they observe it in obedience to the* "*Lawes of the Church, and so it proceeds* "*from obedience to Superiours, a duty of the* 5th. *Commandement.* This argument should not have had the first place, but the second, in a just method. The Doctor should first have proved that they that instituted the Festivall, had a lawfull power to do it; before he proved them that observe the usage, to be innocent. For may not Papists plead the same argument, for observation, of not onely their *Holydaies*, but of their *invocati-*

*on* of Saints, *adoration* of Images, and the Masse it selfe. "*They do it in obedience to the* "*Lawes of the Church, and so it proceeds* "*from obedience to superiours, a dutie of the* 5th *Commandement.* But to the particulars we say many things. 1. Did he not a little before found the *Times* or daies designed to publick worship, upon the *equity* or morality of the 4th Commandement? Hear what he saies, of the *Importance* of that 4th Commandement; "*It is a designation of Time, for the speciall* "*performing of Gods publick worship,* and again, "*It is not onely lawfull, but necessary* "*to set apart some times, for Gods service,* he means by that Commandement: Then say I, if the 4th Commandement, do necessarily require a *designation* of some *Time*, for worship (*private* as well as *publick*; for so hee resolves, in answer to the next question there) does not the *same Commandement* as necessarily require the *observation*, or sanctification of that *Time*, but it must be reduced to the 5. Commandement? Let him remember what he saies, in his Treatise of Will-worship, *Sect.* 4. "*If the matter of the command* "*were before commanded by God, 'twere then* "*no longer obedience to the Law of the Magistrate, but onely to God.* The application is easie, and I adde; must God be *beholden* to men, either for the *designation*, or *observation* of his due *Time*, by a duty from the 5th Commande-

*Vid. Append.*

*Pract. Catech. on 4. Commandement.*

mande-

mandement? What if *Superiours* be ſo *prophane*, as to ſet apart *no time* for Gods worſhip, or not to enjoine and require the *obſervation* of that Time, is every man free, to obſerve ſome, or none, at his pleaſure? what if there be no *Publick Worſhip*? what if a man be and live in places where neither *Time* nor *Publick Worſhip*, is appointed by *Superiours*, is hee now at libertie, to take all *Time*, as his own? ſo it ſeemes, by this Doctrine; if men obſerve *Times*, *Lords day*, and others, onely as a *dutie* to Superiours in the 5th Commandement. *See Sabbath. Redevivum at large these things.*

2. He takes for granted, that the *Deſignation* of the *ſuffieient Time*, due and neceſſary by the 4th Commandement, is in the *power* of men, Church or ſtate; which we ſay, belongs onely to God.

3. He alſo ſuppoſes, that the *Church* or *State* hath power to *Sanctifie* a Time, cc *ſo* cc *that it muſt not ordinarily be mixed with* cc *prophane and common uſes*, which wee think, *God* onely can doe.

4. He alſo takes it as granted, that the *Church* may deſigne, as *little*, or *as much*, as *few* or as many *Times*, or Daies, as they ſhall think fitt, and that ordinarily, cc *in every week*, *or* cc *month*, *or year*, *without Superſtition*, *as an* cc *act of piety*, which we ſuppoſe they cannot do, without prejudice to the 4th Commandement, and to *Chriſtian liberty*; ſeeing the *bur-*

den of Jewish *Holydayes* is taken off, by Christ, and we reduced to the 4th Commandement, as for one day in seaven to be *holy*, so for our *allowance* of six daies, for our own works. The result of this answer is this, that they that retain this *usage* of the *Festival*, as a day made *Holy* by the Church, or state are both *injurious* to God, in *usurpation* upon his prerogative, in the 4th Commandement, and also guilty of *Willworship*, in holding up a *Worship*, not *commanded* by God, against the second Commandement.

2. "*In respect to those who first instituted* "*it, without command from others (in whom* "*onely it is called Will-worship) they are free* "*from guilt too.* 1. *because among the Jewes* "*some Feasts were instituted, that of Purim,* "*and of the Dedication, without command* "&c. 2. *Freewill-offerings of this Nature, are* "*to be the more, not the lesse acceptable, for* "*being voluntary.* To this we say, in generall, it may be *Will-worship* to *observe* what is commanded by others, as well as to institute worship, without a command; In speciall, to the first reason, the *Feasts* instituted by the Jewes, we shall speak anon, here, *sect.* 29. To the second, of *Freewill-offerings*, wee say.

1. These *Holydayes* of mens Institution, are not like those *Freewill-offerings* of the old Law, as we have shewed, upon his Treatise

tise of *Willworship*, *sect.* 29.

2. We add, it is not in the power of men, to *institute* any worship, not commanded by God: and is flatly against the second Commandement: But these *Holydaies*, are by him, made *parts of Worship*.

3. Suppose the *Jewes* should have made more *Holydaies*, yearly, than God commanded, would they have been accepted? should they not have heard, who required these at your hands? wee may guesse by their *Fasts* which they appointed; God instituted one *Fast* onely, once a year; upon the *Expiation* day: They, in their captivity, appointed more, in the 5. and 7. month yearly; but what *acceptance* found they? see *Zech.* 7. 5. "*when yee fasted and mourned in the* 5. *and* 7. "*month, even those* 70. *years, did yee at all* "*fast to me, even to me?* And may not *Papists*, who have a *Saint* and an *Holyday*, allmost for every day in the year, be justified by this arguing? Hath it not a great *shew of wisdome, Piety, Devotion*, to devote most of their time to God? Are they not their *Free-wil-offerings*, the *more acceptable*, because *voluntary*, and uncommanded? Let no man say, they dedicate those daies to *Saints*, and *Invocate* the Saints, *&c.* and that makes them abhominable: But suppose none of those, but the *Holy daies* be (as the *Church* of *England* expressed herself) devoted onely

to

to the *honour* of God; but yet esteemed as more holy, aad as a *Worship* of God; and more acceptable to God, because voluntary: even these, and that orher, chat its *done without command* of God, will denominate them *Will-worship* and so odious to God. And so much for that.

Secondly, he comes now to *vindicate* it from *Superstition*, and saies; "δεισιδαιμονία "*signifies* Superstitum cultus, *worshiping of* "*Damons, or soules of dead men; but its lit-* "*tle lesse then blasphemie, to number Christ* "*with them*, &c. To which we say: For the words δεισιδαιμονία, and Superstition; wee have considered it in his Treatise of Superstition; and have found him granting the sense of them to be farre larger, than the *Worshiping* of D*æmons*: And wee have proved it rather to signifie any *false*, *Superradded* worship, not commanded of God, as *Super statutum*, above the Law of God: In a word, any *false worship* of the true God; which is exemplified in many particulars there: amongst which, this is one, "*In placing the worship of God*, "*or more holinesse, in things, times, places*, "&c. *then God hath placed in them.* Wee shall consider what he saies to vindicate this *Festivall*, from it.

A Nimiety or excesse of Religion.

1. "*The Birth of Christ, is a mercy of such* "*excellent quality, that it can never be over-* "*valued*, &c. This is granted; But to *Institute*

*stitute* a day as *Holy*, without *command* of Christ, for an *Annuall* commemoration of this, is above the power of any Church, and a *Superstitious* presumption: and withall *needlesse*; considering that the *Lords day*, (which includes the commemoration, not onely of his *Birth*, but his Resurrection, and the whole works of our *Redemption* by him) was instituted by himself, or his *Apostles*, by him authorized and inspired, for this very end; & comes about once in every week. To limit it therfore to *one day* in a year, to remember that *Mercy*, is not an *exaltation*, but a *derogation* from it. If this were done, on his owne designed *Day*, wee need not fixe another day.

2. "*The exercises done upon the day, are* "*acceptable duties any day, therefore upon* "*this.* True, but then *any day*, whereon these *duties* are done, is as *holy* a Day, as *Christmas* day: or if he think, the *duties* are more *acceptable* for the *Dayes* sake, or for the *voluntary dedication* of it by men, I feare they will be so much lesse *acceptable* to God, and no better than *Superstition*.

3. There may be *excesse* and *Superstition* in setting out a day every year, *as Holy*, as *a worship* of God, as *Super statutum*: where God requires but *one in seaven* as *Holy*, for men to command more, is too much presumption: His reasons against it are invalide.

1. *Be-*

1. "*Because a dutie cannot be performed* "*without time*; True but without a set, a *fixed holy time*, it may: Here's a fallacie, from *time* as a naturall and necessary *adjunct*, of an action, *to Time*, as *Holy*, as *Worship*. Which yet is not observed by the Doctor; For he, with others, seemes to hold *Time* in the 4th Commandement, to be onely an *Adjunct* of worship, as of any other action; but we think *Time* in the 4th Commandement, is a *part of worship*: And this I think they do make it, in this present case: For they doe not onely make the *duties*, praying, praising, preaching, *&c.* a *part* of worship, (which they are every day, when they are performed) but the very *Dedication*, and *observation* of the *Day* it selfe, to be a *voluntary oblation*, a *Freewill-offering*, an *honour* and service to Christ; as wee shall hear. See f. 48.

2. "*Abraham* (*saies he*) *rejoyced to see* "*this day and the Angells rejoyced on the ve-* "*ry day*, &c. So would we, if wee knew the *Day*; but this does not prove, that they intended to set that day apart as *Holy*, without co mmand from Christ: the *Lords day* being appointed for that end.

3. The *abstaining from labours*, is partly, though not *onely* the *excesse*; for it makes it *necessary*, as a duty of an *Holy day*, when God hath not made it necessary having allowed 6 daies for mens own works: & though *Rest* be a-

agreeable to holy duties, *Festivities* and Fasting daies, of Gods command, yet then it presupposes a *Command* of God for those *Duties* and *Daies*: Or if the *Time* be onely an *Adjunct* of those duties, then *Rest* is necessary onely *naturali necessitate*, not *morali*; because no man can *solemnly* for any time *wait* upon God in holy *duties*, and his *labours* too. But this is necessary any day, when holy *duties* are performed.

4. For the 25th. day of *December* to be the day of *Christs* birth, wee shall speake to it hereafter, *ad sect.* 36. Onely wee observe what he saies, upon the mistake of the day: "*That the mistake will be very pardonable in* "*those, who verily think, they are not mista-*"*ken; They doe perform the businesse of the* "*day, as compleatly and substantially on a* "*mistaken day, as on the true one: and the* "*excuse of blamelesse ignorance, will wash* "*away greater errours than this, if an er-*"*rour.* Does not this sound somewhat like the *Papists* Doctrine of *veniall* sinnes? It puts me in mind of a *subterfuge* of *Bellarm.* and others, when we object (upon their owne confessions) that there may be danger of *Idolatry*, in the Sacrament, if the bread be not *transubstantiated* into the body of Christ: They answer, "*There is no danger of* "*it, to one that simply beleeves it is, and* "*worshiping after his wonted manner?*

"*For*

cc *For in such things, humane certitude is* cc *sufficient; So* Jacobs *lying with* Leah *instead* cc *of* Rachell, *ignorantly, was not guilty of a-* cc *dulterie*, &c. This is, (saiesacute *Chamier*) cc *not to take away Idolatrie, but to stupifie* cc *the Idolater*; can any ignorance be *blameleſſe* againſt a Law of God, or waſh away an Errour without the *blood* of Chriſt? Would not Chriſt have revealed the very day, if he had intended the day to be kept *holy*, as a *worſhip* of himſelf? But I ſhall put him a caſe. Suppoſe the *Jews* had miſtaken the day of the week for the *Sabbath*, or the day of the month for the *Paſſeover*, had they not ſinned becauſe they thought they were not miſtaken? Had the cc *buſineſs been as compleatly and ſub-* cc *ſtantially performed, on a miſtaken day, as on* cc *the true one.* When the very *day* was as *ſtrictly* commanded as the buſineſs it ſelf? Let him conſider it.

I ſhall here inſert the judgement of the learned *Chemnitius*, who, though he allow the *obſervation* of this, and other *Feſtivals* (as a *Lutheran*) with a *reſervation* of Chriſtian liberty, without neceſsity of obligation, *&c.* yet he notes no leſs then thirteen wayes or kinds of *Superſtition*, in *Papiſts* obſervation of *Holy daies*. We note ſome of them.

*Exam. Conc. Trid. p. de diebus Feſt. p. 265*

1. cc *In placing Holineſſe in the dayes,* cc *which God hath not placed in them.*

2. cc *Eſteeming the ſervices then done, bet-* cc *ter*

cc ter and more holy, and acceptable, then if cc done on other dayes.

3. cc Placing the worship of God on them, in cc ceasing from labours, and frequenting of cc Churches.

4. cc Forbidding of labours on those daies cc when they hinder not the publick Wor- cc ship.

5. cc In the Necessity of observation.

6. cc In the multitude of them. To which cc may be added, that

7. cc They discriminate persons, to be more cc or lesse holy, as they observe or neglect them.

cc And lastly, as more grace and blessing is cc expected from such voluntary, uncommand- cc ed observances.

Now how far *many men* amongst us, are guilty of all, or some of these kinds of *Superstition*, it remains to discover.

First, for *placing holiness* in them equall with the *Lords day*, and above other dayes: It appears both by mens words and deeds. By word, in calling them *Holy daies*, and equalling them with the *Lords day*, as both of the *Churches* instituted. The Doctor himself, *sect.* 20. calls this Festival *most sacred*; and *sect.* 24. tels us, cc *The day hath been observed, if* cc *not much more, certainly as strictly as any* cc *Lords day in the year*, &c. And so it was, consecrating it from common to sacred uses.

See Sect. 59. To be esteemed above other daies of the year, &c.

in

in all *Cathedrals* at least, with more *solemn services*; with stricter *cessation* from sports then on the Lords day; on which, sports were permitted, but "*no touching cards, or dice that day*," Ibid.

Sect. 77. being (more then lawfull) pious in it self.

Secondly, not onely the *services*, but the *observation* of the day also, was esteemed an higher piece of service than that of the *Lords day*; *more acceptable*, then commanded worship, because more *voluntarie*. So the Dr. often.

Sect. 59. An oblation to God in honour to him, &c. Treat. of Wilworship, sect. 29.

Thirdly, placing the *worship* of God in the *observation* of the day, as a *voluntarie oblation*, and parallel with the *Freewill-offerings* in the Law (which the Doctor takes speciall notice of, * were *parts of Gods worship*) "*Offer it up a voluntary oblation to Christ, in*" "*the service and to the honour of Christ*," &c. Sect. 28.

See sect. 59. people may not without offence to God follow their lawful vocations on that day. Rest is made an oblation to God:

Fourthly, Forbidding *labours* on that day, with greater *zeal*, and severer *penalties* than on the *Lords day*: It was held and accordingly censured, as more *Piacular*, to worke upon this day, than on the *Lords day*.

Fifthly, In the *necessitie* of the observation of it; in so much as hee was esteemed no good *Christian* that did not observe it.

Sixthly, It became a *note* of *discrimination* of people, as more or less *Religious*. Just as the

the Doctor observed * of the *Hasidai*, and makes it part of their *Superstition*, or *Will-worship*, "*That they first began to add to the* "*law of God, voluntary performances of their* "*owne; then they made them necessary, and* "*laid the obligation of them on others, to doe* "*as they did, and then not being obeyed, dis-* "*criminated themselves from all others, as* "*the onely obedient servants of God, and so* "*called themselves Pharisees.* And was not this *exemplified* in the Institution of this Festivall? At first, after an *Age* or two from the *Apostles*, some began to set up *this* (and other days) as a *voluntary oblation* to Christ, and a pious *Addition* to the *Lords* day: others in time, made it *necessary* (as *Socrates* observed) and then laid the *obligation* of it upon others, to doe as they did; And if they were not *obeyed*, they *discriminated* themselves from such as refused; as the onely *pious* and *Religious* men of the Times. That good *Father* Saint *Austin* was a little faulty here; if that worke was *Austins*: "*All that ac-* "*knowledge themselves sonnes of the Church* "*observe the Festivalls of the Church* cited by the Doctor §. 35. To which the Dr. adds "'*Tis consequent to this, that they which ob-* "*serve them not, disclaime this sonship, and* "*cast themselves out of this family*: Pract. Cat. And hear the Doctors owne *discrimination* of himselfe and his party, by the *censure*

* *Willworship. s.* 28.

*Serm. de Temp.* 250

of himselfe and his party, by the *Censure* of the Refusers. "*The fastidious rejecting, or* "*not observing the Festivalls of the Church* "*universall, the great dayes, &c. must certainly* "*be looked upon by every man, as an act of* "*affected departure from the universall* "*Church of Christ in all ages, as well as from* "*the reformed Church of England his mother.* Sect. 45. Which Sect. 12. he had called "*an* "Act of Division *and* Separation *from that* "*Church of the first and purest* times: How justly or *truly*, let the Reader judge, by that which hath, and shall be said. In the meane time, the Doctor hath handsomely given or taken the name of *Pharisees* to himselfe and his parties, as *volunteeres in worship*, above the *law* of *God*, and left the name of *honest* & modest *Karæj*, unto others, who dare not venture so goe *beyond*, or before the Law, in worship.

*Obj.* But he starts an objection: It hath a *semblance* of that *Mat.* 5. 9. "*Teaching for* "*doctrines the Traditions of men.* He answers; "*Doctrines there, is the affirming a thing to* "*be the pleasure and command of God, (as if I* "*should put the Kings broad Seale, to a deed* "*of my owne) but this is no wayes chargea-* "*ble on those that acknowledge this an Eccle-* "*siasticall institution, and pretend it not to be* "*prescribed by Christ.* I reply, 1 *Teaching for Doctrines here*, is not the *affirming* a thing to be a *command* of God, (or not that onely) but

but is expounded by *Col.* 2. 22. "*after the* "*commandements and doctrines of men*: That is, men out of their *wisdome*, prescribe, and by their *authority* command such and such doctrines, either as very *pious* and *pleasing*, or more *acceptable* to God, as a *voluntary worship*; not alwaies affirming them to bee the commandements of God, but holding them out as the *Traditions* of the Elders, as the Pharisees did. 2. Its so much more *chargeable* on them, (that acknowledge it an *Ecclesiasticall* Institution,) as a kind of *Superstition*; because those *Pharisees* and *false Teachers*, (as he saies) pleaded *Gods Command*, for their doctrines; for what they did, in matter of *worship*: But these *pretend* onely the *Churches* command, which is worse then putting the *Kings* seale to a deed of their owne: For it usurps the very *throne* of God, to appoint his *worship*; which is the *highest Treason*. Other things there are concerning this *controversie*, which we shall take notice of hereafter, and now come to consider, how he can vindicate this *Festivall*, from the *Riot* and excesse, commonly found there; which he acknowledges, "*a sin, and a greater sin in a Christian,* "*than in a Jew, whose promises were of an earthly plenty, &c.* To which we say. *In pract. Catechism.*

§. 17. The Jewish *promises*, being for the most part of earthly plenty (not onely, for they had also *spirituall* promises) they were

permitted (like children fed with *milke* and *hony*) a weeke of earthly joyes and pleasures; But the *promises* and exhibitions of them by *Christ* being all *Spirituall* to Christians; *Spirituall joyes* (are as the Doctor sayes well) the "*Christians eminent, if not onely portion*; but these are not limited to one or twelve dayes in a year, but *daily joyes*, every day is a *Christmas* to a godly heart; "*Rejoyce in the Lord alwaies, againe I say rejoyce.*

ἑορτὴν ἡμῶν ὁ καιρὸς ἅπας. *Chrys.*

§. 18. "*Festivity and hospitality, (its true) are separable from riot*: but very hardly; And if *gluttony* and drunkennesse were the *prescribed worship* in *Heathenish* Feasts; wee have found by long experience, they were the *practised intertainement* of this *Festivall*; which many yeares *preaching* could not reforme. The *heathenish usages* in it (almost yeelded sect. 2.) as they doe imply, that the *Festivall* it selfe was instituted to *gratifie* the Heathens, by imitation of their *feasts* at the same time of the yeare: so God to shew his *dislike*, if not his *detestation* of it, hath suffered these *Humane inventions* and institutions in his service, to be attended and celebrated, with the two *extremes* of true worship, *Superstition* and *Prophanesse*: we shall heare anone, *Sect.* 21. "*That in the ancient Church* "*on dayes of Festivitie, men began to adorne* "*themselves sumptuously to shew their pride,* "*& to fare deliciously, to surfeting & drunken-*

*nesse.*

*nesse.* So soone these *abuses* got into them; and all this while for so many hundred years, could not be gotten out by all the *Fathers*, & *Children* of the Church: The *spirituall dainties* of a Christian, *peace* with God, and *joy* in the holy Ghost, (the *quotidian* Festivall) are free from these excesses. "*Be not drunke* "*with wine wherein is excesse, but be filled* "*with the Spirit, speaking to your selves in* "*Psalmes, and Hymnes, and spirituall songs,* "*making melody in your hearts to the Lord.* Those that have *most* of these, care *least* for earthly joyes; and they that care most for *earthly joyes*, (without which the *Festivitie*, would be thought a time of *Lent*, & *Fasting*) (its feared) least of those *Spirituall* dainties.

§. 19. As some having left this *custome* of *Christmas* (so called) have used their *liberty* of Feasting at other times; which argues, (sayes the Doctor) "*The good cheere not to* "*be the thing disliked in it*:) So others that *keepe up*, or *cry* up the *custome* of the Festivity, have taken the liberty to lay aside *Hospitality* and *Charity*, not onely at that time, but all the yeare long; which shewes it was not so much the *Hospitality* that they liked, as an *old Custome*, received by *Tradition* of their Fathers: which usually sticks (as *Ivie* to the tree) closer to *carnall* hearts, then any truth of Religion, or *Institution* of God:

That *good Cheer* and *Hospitality* and better *cloathes*, are the attendant upon Gods *Festivities*, is a knowne and granted truth: But the Doctor must first prove this, to be one of them *Necessary* or *Lawfull*, and then talke of better cheer and cloaths. *Hospitality* to friends, and *Charity* to the poore, have time enough to be exercised all the yeare; But to make a *Misers Feast*, (as they say) at *Christmas*, and to neglect both neighbours and poore all the yeare after, is but a poore evidence of *Hospitalitie* or *Charitie*.

§. 20. If the Doctor will yeeld (as he seemes to doe) "*That when the Attendant hath destroyed the principall, and the External part shall devoure the inward; and when it shall appeare that the excesses and vices of men, occasioned by the Christmas cheere & sports, are more considerable to the raising of Soules, than his forementioned uses are beneficiall, &c.* That then he will beleeve there is place and *season* of *Reformation* in this particular; The time is long agoe past, when *Reformation* should have found a place and season, not onely of the *excesse* aforesaid, but of the *Festivitie* it selfe, which hath ordinarily, if not inseperably been attended with such mischiefs without the least *attempt* of Reformation.

§. 21. When *pride* and *surfeting*, &c. got first into Festivities, in the *Ancient* Churches (as is confessed) the Fathers had they endeavored

vored the *Removall* of the occasion, the *Feasts* themselves, they had prevented many *grievous sinnes*, which to this day have been the *concomitants* of such *Festivities*, and had saved the *Reformers* of latter times much *worke*, which now they finde by the *opposition* of such as hate to be reformed. As for his "*Discipline* "*to be exercised only upon the riotous* outward party; Saint *Paul* might have taught him a better way of *Reformation*; who when the *Agapæ*, the *Feasts* of *Charity*, (begnu upon good *intentions*, to relieve the poore, and testifie *brotherly* affections) began to be abused to *surfeting* and drunkenesse. 1 *Cor.* 11. did not exercise his *discipline* onely upon the *outward Riotous party*, but upon those *Feasts* themselves, by distraction or *abolition* of them. Some man (perhaps the Doctor,) would have said; must the *abuse* of a *laudable custom* take away the use thereof? might not the *Apostle* have tryed other remedies, "*to rescue a laudable* "*custome, from an impious appendage*? as in the next section.

§. 22. But yet see how *Indulgent* and tender the Doctor is, in his Reformation: "1. *The eating and sporting part, that neede* "*not be abolished, save onely in case of great* "*and generall abuses.* 2. *Nor then, till the* "*abuses are not onely so great, as decernible to* "*out-ballance the good uses, but also so gene-* "*rall, that the whole Church in a manner runs*

"*madding*

"*madding into those very great abuses.* So that lesser and lesser general abuses need no Reformation; this is pretty *unntempered morter*: but we shall assume; The *abuses* have beene long so great, that they *out-ballance* the good pretended, and so *generall*, that the whole *nation*, (if not the whole Church) hath runne *madding* after them; (besides the *Superstition* on the *Churches* part, almost equall to that in the *brazen serpent*, of which before, and hereafter more.) Therefore its time they should be *abolished*, in relation to this Festivity.

§. 23. It is easily beleeved, that not onely the *loosly disposed*, (as he saies) will turne the *Lords day*, into luxury and excess; but also the *superstitiously devoted* to *this day*, who *prefer* it in opinion and practise, above the *Lords day*. These latter will not labour or play upon Christmas day, "*no touching ei-*"*ther cards or dice that day*, as *sect.* 24. But its knowne two well that the *Lords day*, it was the ordinary *practise* of some great *Rabbies*, and *ceremonialists*, after *evening* prayer (if not all the *afternoone*) to *play* at cards, and so continue till night. And this is the common *issue* of all *inventions of men*, in the service of God; as to *preferre* them before the Institutions *of God*, "*The Statutes of* Omri *are kept*: So to make *bold* with Gods *Institutions*, rather then their owne. They (for the most part) that are most *strict* and zealous in pleading

pleading for, and observation of the *Festivalls* are commonly most *remisse*, and loose in observation of the *Lords day*.

§. 24. For this, we have the Doctors owne assertion, "*Christmas day it self, hath been* "*kept, if not much more, certainly as strict-* "*ly, as any Lords day in the year, in frequent-* "*ing the services of the Church*, &c. *in keep-* "*ing at home*, &c. *not touching either cards* "*or dice, that day. The excesses have been on* "*the after daies*, &c. To which we say; First, this is part of the *Superstition* we charge it with; that the *day*, hath been *esteemed* and accounted more sacred, "*most sacred, the Dr.* "*calls it*, sect. 20. *and observed with more*, "*much more, or certainly as strictly as the* "*Lords day, any Lords day in the year*; wee think *equal strictnesse* of observation, were too much; to set their *posts*, cheeke by joale with Gods. But we know the *ground* of this, to be, that they make the *Lords day*, and *Festivalls*, to be founded on the same * *Authority*, *viz.* of the *Church*; and then why (as one of them sayes) should they not have *equal* observation.

See sect. 57. The Lords day by the same authority appointed; yet sect. 31. he saies the Apostles instituted the Lords day.

Secondly, "*the not touching of Cards or* "*Dice, on Christmas day*; (it seemes the Doctor alowes both, on the other daies) may seem to adde to their *Superstition*, or *Hypocrisie*. Their *Superstition* (if cards and dice be lawfull) in that they forbid them on a day, that God hath not forbidden them; which is to make

make it an *holy day*, equall to Gods; (besides that noted in the former section, that some would *touch*, and *touch* again, *Cards* on the *Lords day*) Their *Hypocrisie* (if they be unlawfull) that pretend to *worship* God one day, *by touch not, handle not*, that they may take a *dispensation* or licence to *offend* him all the twelve daies after. For I pray, why are *Cards* or *Dice* more lawfull (I say not on the *Lords day*) on *Stephens* or *Johns* day, than on *Christmas* day? why more *unholy*, or unlawfull on *Christmas* day, than on the other?

Thirdly, "*that the excesses and riot, are* "*onely on other daies after the Nativity*, is a poor excuse; For the whole *twelve daies* are accounted *part* of the Festivity, and ordered to *wait* upon it. *Sect.* 39. "*That feast* "*consisted of all the twelve daies*, saies the learned Doctor. And so the *Day* it selfe, is guilty in part, of all the *excesses* of the following dayes; which are services fitter for the *Revells* of *Bacchus* or *Saturn*, or for the *birthday* of an *Herod*, than for the *Festivity* of a *Spirituall* Saviour.

The Saturnalia were celebrated about the same time. *Sect.* 63.

§. 27. Hee now passes from the *Authority* of the particular *Church* of *England*, to that of the *universall Christian* Church; to shew upon what grounds, *Festivalls* in generall, & this of the *Nativity* in special pretend to stand and that he doth by certain *degrees* or steps.

§. 28. First he acknowledges, "*it hath*

*not*

"not its beginning from any institution of "Christ, but either of the Apostles, or the "succeeding Church. That it was not instituted by the *Apostles*, the same arguments will conclude, which are used against their *Institution* of *Easter*, sect. 6. 1. There is no *mention* either of *Institution* or observation of it in Scripture, nor any *ground* produced thence, to found it on. 2. *Socrates* the *Historian* saies expresly, "*Neither our Saviour*, *Lib. 5.* "*nor the Apostles commanded it*, (*the Feast* *cap. 22.* "*of* Easter) *to be observed*; *and there the* "*scope was not* (*speaking of the* Apostles) *to* "*settle any lawes for Festivall daies*; *but of a* "*good life*. If for no *Festivalls*, then not for this of the *Nativity*. And its observable what he addes; "*There are some who think*, *all* "*whoredome to be a thing indifferent*, *that do* "*contend for Festivall daies*, *as for life*. It must then remain upon the *succeeding Church*. And there is no doubt but this is true, the *succeding* Church, did set up *Festivalls*; but what *Church* was that? not that of the *Apostles* age, nor that of *Apostolicall* men, that had lived some time with the Apostles: For the first *Records* of Fathers we have, say not a word of any such observation. The *succeeding* Church, in the second or third *Centurie*, it seemes, began to take it up: and then *Socrates* addes; "*They that re-* "*ceived such rites*, *from their Ancestors*, *af-*

*terwards*

"terwards transmitted, them to their poste-
"rity as a Law, And here is the most likely *Originall* of all *Festivalls*. Heare what the learned Lord *Faulkland* saies, in a like case, to our purpose "*some of great authority (mo-*
"*ved by a good meaning) might thus deceive*
"*others, these thus deceived, might deceive*
"*others, till being generally spread, other*
"*good men, being loath to oppose them, for the*
"*same reason, for which others desired to*
"*spread them (thinking it an errrour that*
"*would encrease piety) they be at last taken*
"*to have been commanded by the Apostles,*
"*without contradiction.* To which may be added what he had said, in the end of the former page, "*In those things which were be-*
"*leeved very convenient, and yet feared*
"*that unlesse men counted them necessary,*
"*they would be backward to practise, how ea-*
"*sie was it for them to be after taught, un-*
"*der pain of more danger then at first they*
"*were delivered with.* But *Superstitious* rites were never without a *shew of wisdome* as the Apostle saies, *Col.* 2. 23. λόγον σοφίας a faire pretence of Reason. And the Doctor gives us one here. "*It being very reasonable, that*
"*those who acknowledged the receit of such a*
"*mercy from God, as was the gift of his*
"*Son,* &c. *should desire to celebrate the re-*
"*membrance of it, and offer it up a voluntary*
*oblation to Christ.* But if this was so very reasonable

sonable, why did it not seeme so to the *Apostles*, and the *Church* of that and the next age? Or did not they acknowledge the *receit* of such a mercy? and were not their desires as *fervent* for the celebration of a *Remembrance* of it? *&c.* would not *Christ* himselfe respect his owne *service*, and *honour*? Nor his *Apostles* prescribe and institute a *voluntary oblation* to Christ, if they had thought it so great an *honour* to him? Are not all *Superstitious inventions* of men, in the *worship* of God, intended as voluntary oblations to him, because "*they would not have their pietie re-*"*strained within those narrower bounds of* "*doing nothing in the service, and to the ho-*"*nour of Christ, but what was distinctly pre-*"*scribed, and particularly instituted by him*? which is expresly against the second *Commandement* by the *Apostle*, under the word ἐθελοθρησκία *Willworship*. *Col.* 2. 23. & 18. as we have said.

§. 29. "*Such* (*saies he*) *was the Feast of* "*the* Dedication *of the* Altar, *among the* "*Jewes, not instituted by God himselfe; yet* "*the observation of it, was approoved, and* "*confirmed by Christs presence at that Feast,* "Joh. 10. 23. But there may be many *mistakes* in this; and not applyable to the *case* in hand. First, there were (which he takes notice of) three *Feasts* of the *Dedication*, 1. by *Solomon*, 2. by *Zerubbabell* at

the

the *Repairing* of the Temple. 3. by *Judas Maccabaus*, for the purging of it: Now hee cannot but know, that learned men, are *divided*, of which its here meant: Some of the first, some of the second; though its probable it was not meant of either of them; both because, we read not, that those two were ever *observed* above once, and also because of the *time* of the observation specified, *it was in winter*: which the other were not. 2. But grant it of the last; yet there are reasons to think, that it was not a *Religious Festivall*, but *civill*, as the *Feast* of *Purim* seemes to be, *Esth.* 9. 21. 22. "*A day of feasting and* "*joy, and sending portions one to another, and* "*gifts to the poor.* And so its said of the *Feast* of *Dedication*, 1 *Maccab.* 4. 59. "*They or-* "*dering it should be kept yearly, with mirth* "*and gladnesse*: For though it be said, *ver.* 56. *they offered burnt offerings*; yet that was *ver.* 53. *according to the Law*; and so was *worship* commanded. 3. If it yet be said, it was a *Religious Festivall*, and so observed, even the day it self; then it may fairly be suggested, "*That they went beyond their com-* "*mission, in making this feast Annuall and* "*perpetuall, which neither* Solomon, *nor* "Zerubbabell *did theirs, for ought we read.* And so those were kept as *extraordinary* daies of thanksgiving for one turn, onely which we grant lawfull, to be done by the *Superiour* pow-

*Vide* Tolet *in Ioh.* 10. 23.

powers, as also we do, *extraordinary* daies of *Humiliation*: which the Doctor also approves; pract. Catech. *Append.* p. 304. 4. Another *mistake* is this; "*that that Feast was approved & confirmed by Christs presence at it.* The text produced saies no such thing, but onely thus, "*It was at* Jerusalem, (*marke that,* "*not at the Temple*) *not elsewhere the Feast* "*of the* Dedication; *and ver.* 22. *Jesus* "*walked in the Temple*: So hee did other daies, any day, when no *Feast* was: Hee was present in the *Temple*, not at the *Feast*; for ought appeares, which it seemes, was kept with *joy* and *Feasting* in the Citie.

§. 30. The like may be said of the *Festivities at marriage*, which were not indeed instituted by God, nor need to be, being that *Marriage* it selfe is a *Civill* thing, and not *Religious*; and in things of that nature, if they were *soberly* and *temperately* observed, *Christ* was never scrupulous, to conform to the *customes* of the places, where he came. But *Christmas day*, is made a piece of "*Religious* "*service, and a voluntary oblation to the ho-*"*nour of Christ*, by others, and by the Dr. himselfe. *sect.* 28.

§. 31. These *Instances* then are both impertinent, what hath he "*more pertinent* "*to the present purpose*? Why, that which I still expected to meet with; is his strongest *plea*: for this he saies, "*It must be remembred*

*bred, that the weekly Fast of the Resur-*
"*rection (the Lords day) was not instituted*
"*by Christ, or God himselfe; but by the*
"*Apostles of Christ: and that the mentions*
"*of the first day of the week, are no prescrip-*
"*tions or Law, for the observing of it,* &c.
Before we hear more, lets consider this: For first, there want not learned men, who thinke that *Christ* himselfe did institute or *designe* the day. But secondly, if the *Apostles* did institute it (as the Doctor grants) thats more than some of his *Colleagues* will grant, (and thank him for it) and more than he dare *peremptorily* say, of his Christmas day: Hee speaks it doubtingly, "*either of the Apostles,*
"*or succeeding Church.* Secondly, if the *Lords day* was instituted by the *Apostles* of Christ, do not their *Institutions* carry in them, a *Divine prescription* or Law, for the *observation* of it? And if they instituted the *first day* of the week, to be the *Lords day*, or *Christian* Sabbath, do not at least some *mentions* of the *first* day, of the *week*, imply their *Institution* of that day to be *holy*, and require withall the *observation* of it? as 1 *Cor.* 16.2. in the judgement of some, no great *Favourers* of the *Lords day Sabbath*? Lets now hear what hee saies more. "*If any thing of that nature (as*
"*a law) be there sought for, it will rather*
"*appear to belong to the Annuall, than weekly*
"*Feasts,* So 1 Cor. 5.8. ἑορτάζωμεν *let us*
*keep*

cc *keep the paschall Festivity, is annexed im-*
cc *mediately, to Christ our Passeover,* &c. *and*
cc *to that also, the κυριακὴ or Lords day,* Rev.
cc 1. 10. *is thought to belong.* To which I say.

1. The *vulgar Latin*, authorized by the Church of *Rome*, (as willing to make *Easter* of Apostolick *Institution*, as the Doctor) did not find this Law for it, in this text: That renders it onely *epulemur*, let us *keep Feast*; though the word signifie also, *festum diem agere*; and is by some, no mean ones glossed thus; cc *Because on Festivall daies, there were*
cc *solemn Feasts of flesh observed*; *hence this*
cc *word is used, for to celebrate* festum & cc solemne epulum, *a solemn Feast or Banquet*;
cc *by allusion to the typicall Paschall Feast.* Before him the learned *Aquinas*, could not find *Easter* here. cc *Epulemur, scilicet man-*
cc *ducantes Christum*, &c. *let us feast*, viz. *eat-*
cc *ing Christ, not onely Sacramentally but spi-*
cc *ritually.* Before them Saint *Chrysostom*, was not so *quick sighted* to find a Law for *Easter* here, but an *every day Holyday*, for so he saies. cc *The Apostle saying, let us keep*
cc *the Feast, he said not, because the pasch or*
cc Easter *or Pentecost was present, but shewing*
cc *that all or every time, is a Festivall season*
cc *to Christians.* And presently after, ἑορτὴν γὰρ
cc ἡμῖν ὁ καιρὸς ἅπας: *every day is a Festivall*
cc *to us: yea all our life.* Not much unlike doth

*Estius in locum.*

*In locum.*

Saint *Ambrose* interpret the word, "*Hoc* "*est latitiam habentes renovationis, facta* "*vetera fugiamus*, That is, having the glad-"nesse of renovation, let us fly our old works, &c. I adde but one thing more; The learned Bishop of *Winchester*, who pleads as strongly for this *Easter* Feast, as any, yet founds it not upon this text, though he had occasion to name it, but upon the *Custome* of the Church.

*Serm. of Resurr.*

2. It is proved above, out of *Socrates*, that the *Apostles* instituted not any *Holydaies* (except the *Lords day*) therefore nor this of *Easter*.

3. That the *Lords day* Rev. 1. 10. should belong to the *Easter* day, is the *fancie* of some, who of late have laboured to depresse the honour of the *Lords* day; contrary therein to all the *antient* and *modern* writers. In a word, (as was said afore) the *difference* in observation of it, in the severall Churches, argues it not to be *Apostolical*. Which difference the Doctor notes in this *Section*.

§. 32. Its true that *Aerius* is by *Epiphanius* branded as an *Heretick*, for some opinions, *justly*, if they be truly charged upon him: But it is well known to the learned, that all is not *Heresie*, that *Epiphanius* calls so: Nor all *Aerius* opinions justly censured as *Heretical*; as the Doctor, or any may see, if he consult with *Ostander*, the *Epitomizer* of the *Centuriators*.

*Epit. Hist. Cen. 4. cap. 47.*

*viators.* And he is found, in some of those *opinions* to be seconded by divers *antient Fathers*, as is asserted by some of our learned *Modern Divines*, if it were not unnecessarie here to manifest.

2. As for the *Festivities* of the *Martyrs*, it is granted, they began betimes (as *Superstition* ever attends *Religion* and Devotion) which though they were intended for good ends, yet (as things of mens *Inventions* do) they produced in time, much *Superstition*, not onely in *multiplication* of Holydaies, but in *opinion* of *more Holinesse*, *more* * *efficacie* of prayers on such daies, and at last, *flat Idolatry*, both in *dedication* of the daies to those Saints and *Martyrs*, and to *Invocation*, and *praying* to them: Which at first were onely times of *commemoration*, of their vitues and *encouragements* of Imitation of them. And this might suffice for answer, to the next section.

As the Romans did, *s.* 67.

§. 33. Yet when he would inferre, from this example of the *Martyrs* Festivities: "*Where will be no reason to doubt, that so the* "*daies of the death or Martyrdome of the* "*Apostles themselves, were formerly solem-* "*nized by them; and that this early*, &c. he *presumes* too much upon his own reason; not able, it seemes, to produce any *Testimonies*, of those or former times, for such observations; which I the rather take notice of, be-

cause the Doctor uses not to *wave* any Testimonie, that doth but look that way; and allso becausse I observe, that the learned *Chemnitius*, a man of *vast reading*, having reckoned up the *Festivalls*, that were in observation, in the first four hundred years, can find none, by name, of any *Apostle*; but referres them to the time of *Carolus Magnus*, *Anno* 800. or at least to *Constantines* time; which was in the begining of 400.

*Vbi supra p. 263.*

§. 35. That *Christmas*, or the Feast of the Nativitie, was not *Apostolicall*, hath been made appear before; That which he now alledges from the *Constitutions* called *Apostolicall*, will weaken his cause the more, becausse they are generally accounted *posthumous* and spurious. And that saying of *Nicephorus*, (no very credible Author) "*that* Justinns *the* "*Emperour commanded it to be kept Festival* "*over the World.* Shakes the Antiquity of it; For if the *Apostles* had instituted it, it wonld have had an *universall* observation, over the world, long before *Justinus* his daies, ho lived in the 6. *Century*. As for *Diocleſians* burning so many thousand on *Christmas* day, wee have spoken before; and onely now note, that *Nicephorus* saies, it was done by *Maximinus*; However this was, in the beginning of the 4th *Centurie*; as was said above.

§. 36. Though it be not much *Materiall* to the

the Festivities observation, whither it was the 25. day of *December*, as now of late, it was kept, or some other day, (as he elsewhere saies) yet the *proofes* for that day, are not very cogent. Its probable they that first instituted the day, did fixe it, by some *Tradition*, on that day. Some, yea many things there are, that may make us *doubt* of the truth of our *Calculation*. *Sect.* 61:

First, the Doctor himselfe hath given us one *ground* of scruple, *sect.* 7. when he saies, "*Christmas day is in our old Monuments*, "*called* Midwinter *day*, *which is the day of* "*the Winter Solstice*, confessed by him to be a fortnight distant, from the 25. of *December*.

Secondly, it hath been the *opinion* of many, if not most of our learned *Divines*, that our *Lord* dyed, when he was about 33. and halfe years of age, (or near unto 34. as the Doctor saies) Now the death of *Christ* was at the time of the *Passeover*, about our *March*, or *Aprill*; If now *Christ* died at 33. and an half; then count 6. months *backward*, when he was just 33. years old, and that will fall about *September*: If at 34. compleat, then hee was born and dyed just about the same time, that is about *Aprill*: Thats another ground of scruple, in our Calculation. *Quer.* 1. *Sect.* 10.

Thirdly, the *Arabick Codex* of the *Counsells*, is of *younger date*, not able to justifie

fie the *Canons* called *Apostolicall*, to be Apostolicall.

Fourthly, *Sect.* 37. the Doctor himselfe, is upon his *ifs*, and tis probable; "*If it were* "*framed by those that succeeded the Apostles*, "&c. *so it is probable they were first intitled*, "*Canons of Apostolicall men: Or if it were* "*one of those which in succeeding times* "*were added and put into that volum*, &c. This is enough to shake the *authority* of those Canons, and so the *Antiquity* of the Festivall on such a day.

§. 39. Its very like that *Twelfe day* is of the same *Originall*, and same *Antiquity* with *Christmas* day, or not not much younger, but both of them *Posthumous* to the *prime* Antiquity. The observation of both, not much differing in their solemnitie. "*A speci-* "*all Holyday* (*imitating the custome of the* "*Jewes, which kept the first and last daies of* "*every Feast, daies of solemn assembly*) so *speciall* and *solemn*, that it outwent the *Lords day*, as *Christmas* also did; which is *usuall*, for mens inventions to *ent do* the Institutions of God.

§. 40. Bnt there is something that weakens the *Antiquity* of this *Twelfe day* Festivall. *viz.* that it is not certain.

1. whence it had the name of the *Epiphanie*: whither from the *appearing of the Star* to

*Vide Chemnit: Prolegom. 4. p. 14. a. in Harmon. & p. 15: a.* As baptized in the beginning of December.

to the wisemen, or from the *descending* of the Holy Ghost upon *Christ*, at his Baptisme; or (as the Doctor himself addes, *Sect.* 41.) "*From the first appearing of Christ in the World.*

2. It is made more uncertain, because *Epiphanius* affirms, "*that many orthodox* "*Christians, in* Ægipt *did keep the Feast of* "*the Nativitie on that Twelfe day.* And the Doctor saies, hee is more inclined to the last of the three conjectures, that is, "*that* Epi- "phania, *signifies the day, when Christ was* "*born in the flesh*, *as* Epiphanius *had said*, which though the Doctor say, that it is confuted by Saint *Hierome*; yet is enough to shake the *Authority*, of the Institution, that certainly it is not *Apostolicall*, nor by the Primitive purest Churches, when the name was not agreed on, in *Epiphanius* time; (in the fourth Centurie) nor the day it selfe distinguished, but *Christmas* day by some, was observed on the same day. Whither the *Magi* came to Christ, the next twelfe day after his Birth, or that day twelvemonth, I shall not dispute; onely I shall tell the Doctor, that *Cheronicus* is of opinion, that they came the twelfth day after Christs Birth, and seem to have reason for it; The 41, 42, 43. *Sections* may receive their solution, from what is allready said. *Sect.* 45. *Harm in locum.*

§. 44. But now hee will put it beyond all

question, by the testimony of *Chrysostome*, and other Antients; "*out of the censuall Ta-*
"*bles of* Augustus, *the Registers of such as*
"*were enrolled at the Taxe*, Luc. 2. 1. *toge-*
"*ther with the place and day of the month*
"*and year when it was done.* This indeed would end the question concerning the day of *Christs Birth*, but makes yet nothing to the maine question; That *Christmas* (so called) is of *Apostolicall* Institution; or of the *next age*. Lets hear what may be said to those Testimonies. To begin with the most antient, *Justin Martyr* he brings the *Rolls* to evidence *the place of Christs Birth*, but saies not a word of the observation of the *Festivitie* of his Birthday, in his time. The like may be said for *Tertullian*; He alledges the *Rolls*, *fidelissimum testem Dominicæ Nativitatis*: (marke that) a most faithfull *witnesse* of the *Lords Nativity*, (which *Marcion* denyed) not *Natalis Dei testem*, a witnesse of the *Observation* of his Birthday, as Festivall in his time; or on the 25. of *December*: for he makes no mention of that *Festivall* at all, which is probable he would, if any such *Custome* had been then in *Being*. The whole *weight* then of the businesse must lye upon Saint *Chrysostom*; who in his *Hom.* of the *Nativity*; saies, "*We have received the day from those*
"*that accurately knew these things, and*
"*which dwell in the City of* Rome. Suppose

we

we shotld grant this *Testimonie* to be true and *Authentick*, for the day of our *Lords Birth*; (which yet is doubtfull, by what hath been said before, and shall anone) yet this will not prove that *Antiqnity* of the *Festivall*, which the Doctor would thence conclude. For besides, that *Chrysostome* lived in the fourth *Centurie*, when the *Tradition* was grown to a Law, (as *Socrates* said) himselfe gives us occasion of scruple, by the weakness of his proofs. He tells us of at hreefold *demonstration*, that the *Day* which they celebrated, was in the month of *December*, called by the Greeks Ἀπελλαιος; as the month wherein *Christ* was conceived, was called Δυσιος: Wee shall consider his *Demonstrations* in order. *Tom. 5. p. 512. l. 23.*

1. The first is this, "*That this Festivall "was so suddenly published every where, and "that it arose and flourished to such an height.* But does the Father at all, go about to prove this? That which he saies is, "*That "the preaching of the Gospell (so I think he "meanes) or of Christ, by tentmakers, fish- "ermen, and vulgar men, took the whole "World, in few yeares, by the power of him "that was preached.* But he saies not a word, when the *Feast of the Nativity* first began to be celebrated.

2. His second *Demonstration* is from the great *Taxing* of the World by *Augustus*, when

when all went to be *taxed*, into his own City: At which time *Joseph* and *Mary* going up to *Bethlem*, *Christ* was born, *Luk.* 2. 6. 7. Now the time of this Tax, was recorded in the *Rolls* of *Augustus* at *Rome*; and the good *Father*, was certified from thence, by some that dwell there, that it was in such a *Month*, and such a year. All this may be granted; but this proves onely the truth and time of Christs birth; but not the *observation* of the day as Festivall: Yes, may some say, with the Doctor, for the Father addes, "*Those that lived there, did observe that* "*very day (that we doe)* ἀνωθεν καὶ ἐκ παλαι-"ᾶς παραδώσεως, *from their Ancestors, and* "*from antient Traditions (as the Doctor* "*renders the words) and sent us the know-*"*ledge of it.* This might well be, if we consider the time and *Age* that both they and this *Father* lived in, which was (as we said) in the fourth *Centurie*: an 100. or 200. yeares before, might be so stiled, an *antient Tradition.*

3. His last *Demonstration*, is from the consideration of the time of *Johns* conception, which was, 6. *Months*, before the conception of his and our Lord; as the Scripture saies expresly, *Luk.* 1. 26. Now the ground of all his large discourse, is upon this *Supposition*, that the *message* of *Johns* conception came to *Zacharias*, in the month of *September*; from whence the sixth month, when the *Angell* came

came to *Mary*, and she conceived her Sonne, was *March*, and as we calculate it, the 25. day. From thence count 9. months more, and it falls to be just our *December*, and the 25th day thereof. But how proves the *Father*, the first, that *Zacharie* was officiating in the Temple, in our month of *December*? his discourse is very large: The sum of all comes to this: Hee takes for *granted*, these two things.

First, that *Zacharie*, was then *high Priest*, and secondly, That the time was, the *Feast* of *Tabernacles*, and the day of *expiation*, on the 7th month, and 10th day of the month, at which time onely the high *Priest* and he *alone* went into the *most holy* place. Now (saies the Father) *Zacharie* was at this time *gone* alone into the *most holy place*, and all the people were without praying, *Luk.* 1. 9, 10. This he proves, because its said, when the *Angel* came to him, he saw him standing on the *right side* of the Altar of incense; which *Zacharies* lot was to burn, at that time: The *Altar* of burut offerings (saies he) was *without*, and the Altar of incense *within* the Vail. But now, if learned men be not mistaken, this is a great *mistake* in this *Father*. For first, the *Author* of the *Notes* upon the fift *Tome* of *Chrysostome*; (Sir *Henry Savill*, I suppose) makes this observation upon the *Fathers* words, *pag.* 515. l. 24. πόθεν ὑπολαμβάνω, "*From the premises of* Chrysostome, no

So in *Ambr. in locum.*

"*no conclusion can be collected, unlesse first it*
"*be proved, that* Zacharie, *was the high Priest,*
"*which yet was not true: allthough this Fa-*
"*ther, nourisheth his same opinion, in other*
"*places, by what probable argument at least,*
"*led to it, I know not.* So farre he.

Secondly, *Chemnitius* is confident, he was not *High Priest*, by many reasons. 1. *Luke* calls him simply *Priest*, and officiating in the order of his course, *ver.* 8. and that was, of the course of *Abia*, *ver.* 5. who was not of the *High Priests* line, but an ordinary *Priest*, of the 8th course, of the 24. 1 *Chron.* 24. 7. 10.

2. He officiated, and burnt incense by *Lot*; but so did not the *High Priest*, but by office. *Exod.* 30. 7.

3. The *Altar* of *Incense* was not within the *Vaile*, but without, and there *Zacharie* was ready at least to burne *Incense*, when the *Angell* stood on the right side of it. The *High Priest* did offer his *Incense* indeed within the Vail, but that was in a *Censer*, not upon the *Altar*; as is said, *Levit.* 16. 12. but he onely took *coales* from the Altar of the burnt offering; and *Incense* from the Altar of of Incense, and put them both in a *Censer*, and offered it *within* the Vail: whereas the other Priests offered it daily, *without* the Vaile. Now the *Supposition* of the Father, being ungrounded, what he builds upon it, will be farre from a demonstration. But if all his

his *proofes* were good, that the month was *December*, and the day, the 25. of that month, whereon Christ was born; wee aske again, what is this to prove the *Antiquity* of the *Festivall* of the Nativitie? *Chrysostome* himself hath much shaken the *Authority* of the Church, Universall, in constituting it, and celebrating of it, in all ages: For, it seems, it was very *questionable* in his time; whither it was a *new* or an *antient* custom: Heare his own words, in the Homilie where he so earnestly pleads for it. "*I know very well, that* "*many are even now doubtfull amongst them-* "*selves, concerning this day; some accusing,* "*some defending: And there is much talke* "*every where about this day, some charging* "*it to be new, and of late Originall, and now* "*brought in: Other apologizing for it, that* "*it is antient, and from the beginning, fa-* "*mous and manifest in many places; to those* "*that inhabit* Thracia, &c. So that it seems, to be a *Tradition* indeed of some standing, and observed in many places, but not *universally*, in *Chrysostomes* time, in the fourth Centurie: Yea *questioned* by many; and so no nniversall, much lesse, an *Apostolicall* Institution; which all this while, the Doctor hath endeavoured to make the World beleeve. *Tom. 5. p. 512. l. 15.*

§. 45. His conclusion then, must needs be like his *premises*, weak and insufficient, if not *injurious*:

*injurious*: That, "*the fastidious rejecting, or* "*not observing the Festivalls of the Church* "*Universall, the great daies*, &c. *must cer-* "*tainly be looked upon, by every man, as an* "*act of affected departure, from the Univer-* "*sall Church in all ages; and not onely from* "*the reformed Church of* England. An heavie *charge*, if it can be proved once, as it is asserted twice here, and *Sect.* 12. before. But now, I can return him this answer.

1. That he hath not at all proved, that the *Universall Church* of the first Age, hath observed any of them; nor the *Universall* Church, in many after *ages*, hath observed all those which he hath named.

2. There was a time, when the *Universall Church* of some, yea many ages, and this of *England* among them (I meane during the time of *Antichrists revelling* in all Churches) observed may more *Holydaies* than the *reformed* Church of *England* did observe, or he pleads for. Will he say the *Church* of *England*, and himself are guilty of an *affected departure* from the Universall Church? If the Church of *England* at her first *Reformation* saw cause, and had *Power* to throw away some; may not the same *Church* of *England*, having the same power, upon just the same or like reasons, cast off the rest? If he say; Hee speaks it of the *Universall* Church of all Ages, and especially of the *first age*, wee shalll

joyne

joyne issue with him therein; and and say, If he can prove (which I am confident he cannot) that in *rejecting*, or not observing, these *Festivalls*, wee have departed from the *Universall* Church in all ages; wee shall be content to let his censure fall upon us; till then, we are safe. And for a closure of the whole matter; we shall take into consideration his *Rule*, prescribed in his first *Querie*, about *Resolving* controversies, and be judged by it. It is this. "*What ever hath the con-* *Quere* 1. "*cordant attestation of the Christian Church* *Sect.* 35 "*of the first ages (the Scripture remaining* "*obscure, or silent in the matter) that it, was* "*the Doctrine or practise Apostolicall, there* "*remains not to any that now lives, any ima-* "*ginable ground of sober or prudent doubting,* "*or questioning the truth of it.* This resolution, and *Case*, the Doctor beginns with, and intends it as a *Rule*, applicable to all the following cases; "*against Socinians, and other* "*Hereticks and Schismaticks*, Sect. 40. Hee means, (we thank him) those that *reject* this Festivall, as *Sect.* 12. and 45. of this *Quarie*, appears: But is this *Rule* universally true? Are there no *cautions*, nor exceptions? yes, three at least.

1. It must be in cases, "*where the Scrip-* "*ture is either obscure or silent in the mat-* "*ter.*

2. "*That it be not extended any further,* *than*

"*than to the primitive Antients.*

3. "*And again to an accordance of those* "*Testimonies* (*without any considerable op-* "*position*) *that this or that was delivered* "*from the Apostles.* We shall (by his leave) apply this rule, to the case in hand; and dare *venture* to be judged by it: First considering the *Rule*, and then the cautions.

And first for the *Rule* it selfe, we desire to know again, what he means, by "*the Church* "*of the first ages*? If he take it *inclusively*, to take in the Churches of the *Apostolicall* time, while *they* were yet alive, wee should not stick to grant his rule to be good. "*What* "*ever doctrine or practise hath the concor-* "*dant attestation of that Church, it was Apostolicall.* The *Negative* whereof being a *surer Rule* to judge by; "*What ever doctrine* "*or practise wants such concordant, univer-* "*sall, uniform Attestation, is not Apostolical.* For they being all guided, by on Spirit, would all agree, *uniformly*, in the same *Doctrine*, or *practice.* But there are not many things so attested by the Church of that age. On the other side, if he meane it *exclusively* of that age, and to include onely the after ages, it will prove a *Crooked* Rule; Many *Doctrines*, and practises being taken up, which were not Apostolicall, but meer *Inventions* of men; which like a *Gangreen*, soon over-spead the face of the Church: And by the

different

different *Timing*, and *observation* of them, proved by the best *Divines* not to be Apostolicall.

Secondly, for "*the concordant attestation,* "*of the primitive Antients, of the second,* "*or third Age, without considerable oppositi-* "*on.* (which is one of the Cautions) that this was delivered *from the Apostles*; I shall put in a just exception, in the words of the learned and honoured Lord *Falkland*; in his discourse, "*Of the infallibility of the Church* "*of* Rome; who plead; the *universall Tradition* of the Church, for their *Religion*, (as the Doctor does, for his *Christmas*.) Thus he writes: "*If the Relation of one* Pappias "*could cozen so farre, all the prime Doctors* "*of the Church Christian, into a beliefe of* "*the celebration, of a thousand years after* "*the Resurrection, so as, that not one of those* "*two first ages, oppose it, (marke that) till* "Dionysius Alexandrinus, *who lived at least* "250. *yeares after Christ: nay, if those* "*first men, did not onely believe it, as proba-* "*ble, but* Justin Martyr, *saith, he holds it,* "*and so do all that are in all parts, Orthodox* "*Christians.* Irenæus *sets it down directly for* "*a Tradition, and relates the very words that* "*Christ used, when he taught this; which is* "*plainer than any other Tradition, is proved,* "*or said to be, out of Antiquity, by them (of*

cc Rome) *If I say, these could be so deceived,* cc *why might not other of the Antients, as* cc *well be deceived, in other points?* And then cc *what certainty shall the learned have (when* cc *after much labour, they thinke they can* cc *make it appear, that the Antients thought* cc *any thing a Tradition) that indeed it was* cc *so,* &c. The Doctors *wisdome* can easily apply this to the case in hand. And I perceive he was aware of such an *objection*, and therefore labours to *prevent* it, by saying, cc *That* cc Justin Martyr, *the prime asserter of it (thats* cc *a mistake, for he and* Irenæus *also, had it* cc *from* Pappias, *who was their Senior*) cc *confesses, other Christians, of pure and pious* cc *intentions, to be otherwise minded.* But for that, let him answer his friend the Lord *Falkland*, who saies, cc *That* Justin Martyr *saies,* cc *that in his time, all (all) Orthodox* cc *Christians held it, and joynes the opposers,* cc *with them who denyed the resurrection, and* cc *esteems them among the Christians, like the* cc *Saduces among the Jewes:* and again saies, cc *It found no resistance, in above two Ages,* cc *by any one known, and esteemed person.* And what now is become of the Doctors *Rule*?

*Quær.* 1: *sect.* 38.

*Lo. Falk. reply p.* 73.

Thirdly, the *Rule* applyed to the case in hand, will prove, (more then the Doctor intended) a *light* to discover his *Christmas* far from

from an universall, Apostolicall usage; For.

1. The Rule must hold, onely in things, "*wherein the Scripture is obscure, or silent*: But for *Institution* of Feasts, (particularly this of Christmas) the Scripture is neither obscure nor silent. For the Scripture is cleare, and speaks aloud against it; both in the Law, the fourth Commandement, which requires *peremptorily*, but one of seaven for God, *allowing* six for mens occasions; and also in the *Gospell*, which clearly speaks, against *observation* of daies (except the Lords day, the the Christian Sabbath) whither *Jewish*, *Heathenish*, or *Christian. Festivalls* of old, were part of the *Ceremoniall yoke*, upon the *Jewes*, and therefore to give the Church a power, to institute *Holydaies*, is to reduce the yoke again.

2. They have not the *concordant* Testimonie of the *Primitive* Antients; neither of the *Apostles* themselves, nor of those that lived, in the same age with them, as of *Ignatius*: nor in the second Centurie, of *Pappias*, *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, &c. which may the better be believed, because the Doctor brings not one instance of any of those, so much as *mentioning* this *Festivall*, except out of the *Constitutions* of the Apostles, falsely so called; which *Isodorus* (by *Gratians* report of him,

*Dist.* 16.) saies, "*Where known to be cor-*
"*rupted by Hereticks, under the name of the*
"*Apostles*, This *Chemnitius* further proves, because the *Fathers* of the first Ages, doe not so much as *intimate* any such *usage* in their times. "*No mention there is, amongst the*
"*most antient, of celebrating the Feast*
"*of the Nativitie, till* Basills, Nazianzenes,
"*and* Chrysostomes *time*, who lived not till the fourth Centurie at least: They say indeed, it was in *practise*, in some places, before their time; but that might be, some 100. more or lesse years, and yet be farre from the *first ages* of the Church, or being *Universall.*

3. Another of the Doctors cautions is, it must be attested, "*without any considerable*
"*opposition.* But this, his Christmas found in the fourth *Centurie*, as we heard, *Sect.* 44. In *Chrysostomes* time, there was a considerable opposition; "*Many being doubtfull,*
"*many charging the Festivity, with novelty,*
"*and as of late brought in*: For a *conclusion*, then of all; the Doctors *Censure* is too harsh, and the *Character* too hard, that is set upon the refusing of it. "*That it hath nothing*
"*but the Novelty and contempt of Antiqui-*
"*ty to recommend it unto any.* We shall onely put him in mind of two places, in his own writings. The one here, at *Sect.* 35. the other

Testi-

Testimony of *Nicephorus*; "*That* Justinus "*the Emperor first commanded it to be kept* "*Festivall over the world.* Then say I, it was not an *Universall usage* in all ages of the Church (which the Doctor hath so long pleaded for) for *Justinus* lived in the sixt *Century*: I know what hee answers to it: "*That belonging onely to the edict of the Em-* "*perour for the universall observation, doth* "*no way prejudge the Churches, whither A-* "*postolicall, or Primitive Institution of it.* Its enough to prejudge the *universall observation* of it, in all Ages; and consequently it is not Apostolicall.

The other place is in his *Practicall Catechisme*, where he confesses, "*It was not so-* "*lemnized universally, till about 400. yeares* "*after Christ.* How often hath he charged us, with departure from the *Universall Church*, in *rejecting*, and not observing the *Festivities* of the *Universall Church*: &c. *Sect.* 12. and in that *Sect.* 45. I hope, upon second thoughts, hee will be more moderate in his *Censures*; and find that his rash zeale for the *Authority* of the Church his Mother, and *Tradition* of the Antients his Fathers, hath carried him beyond the *bounds* of *Reason*, and *Religion*. pag. 181.

§. 46. The remaining part of the Doctors discourse, is spent in answering 16. *Queries*,

propounded by another; But most of what hee hath said, may be taken away, by what hath above beene answered: I shall not put my sickle into another mans Corn; but leave it to the *Author* of them, or some friend of his, to vindicate them.

§. 74. The Doctor now, for a conclusion, drawes out some *Quares*, of his owne to be considered and answered, by him, that shall undertake this businesse: "*as a shorter way,* "*to question and debate the truth, or supposed* "*certainty of some of his own principles:* For an essay, this

§. 75. "*Whether it be not lawfull for the* "*Church, either nationall, of one, or Uni-* "*versall of all parts of Christendome,* "*especially of that age neareſt the Apostles,* "*of the first and purest time, to take upon* "*it to institute one or more daies, upon any* "*speciall occasion of some eminent mercy of* "*Gods, toward the whole Church, to be used* "*yearly, in acts of Christian piety and chari-* "*ty, by all the Children of that Church,* "*and to expect obedience from them.* But under favour, this is not the *question* now between us; For not only the *Lutherans*, but even the most *rigid Calvinists*, and *Nonconformists* (as they were called) do grant, "*That the Church, or rather the State, hath*

*Chemnit. Exam. de dieb. Fest. Ames. Medul. in 4. precept. D. Riv. in Exod. 20. p. 206. 6.*

*power*

'*power*, *to set apart any day to the acts* "*of piety, and charity, not onely upon ex-*" *traordinary eminent mercies, but upon* "*ordinary occasions*, provided 1. They be not too many, for number; nor 2. Imposed as necessary, to the prejudice of Christian libertie. Nor 3. made *parts* of the worship of God: and other like cautions and conditions, by them prescribed: And if the *Superiour* Powers shall appoint such daies, so qualified, this may secure both those that *institute* them, and those that *observe* them, from any crime of *Superstition*. Its more then probable, that they who first appointed those daies, in *memory* of the *Martyrs*, in their particular *Churches*, intended no more, but on such a day yearly, to *commemorate*, the *Faith* and constancie of those holy *Sufferers*, as with *thanks* to God, for his Graces in them, so to the *Incouragement* of other Christians, to imitate their virtues; But after *Ages* soon grew *Superstitions*, in their *Number*, in their use and end: " *Dedicating daies to* "*to Saints*; *Invocating them in their* "*prayers*; *Making the observation of* "*them necessary*: *The daies themselves* '*holy, holyer than other daies, than the* '*Lords day*: *placing the worship of God*

"in them; expecting more acceptance, "more blessing from the services of those "daies, as a voluntary worship. These abuses were foreseen by the *Reformed Churches*, and thereupon, either the Daies were rejected altogether, by some; or cautioned against by others; especially, by this Church of *England*; as all doe know. But when this last generation of misdevout men, began to exceed in the *honour*, *estimation*, and *observance* of those remaining *Festivalls*, especially this of *Christmas*; *equalling* them *with*, if not preferring them above the *Lords day*, (as was said before) *&c.* then those that were *conscientious*, and *tender* of the *Worship* of God, beganne to oppose such *inchroachments* upon it, who formerly did *observe* the daies; and others, that thought they had *Power* in their hands, did lay them aside, upon these reasons. It were too long, to instance the particular *Superstitions*, not onely of the *vulgar* people, but even of many *Divines*, discovered in their *Practises* and *Discourses* against the *Lords day*, and for the *Holydaies*: None that I know, or have met with, have manifested more *vaies* of being *Superstitious*, in this Subject of *Holydaies*, than the Doctor in this

this discourse of *Festivalls*; as hath beene made appeare, at the end of the sixteenth *Section*; to which I referre the *Reader*, and proceede to his second question.

§. 77. "*Whither such an antient Institution of the Church of Christ, by name, the anniversarie feast of Christs birth, though it be not affirmed to be commanded by Christ, or instituted by the Apostles, or (in it selfe considered, without respect to the Institution) absolutely necessary to the being of a Church; yet being thus (more than lawfull) pious in it selfe; proper in respect of the ground, primitively (catholick, (if not Apostolick) in respect of the Institution, may be lawfully abolished.* &c. Wherein the Doctor takes for granted, these things, which he hath not proved.

1. That this *Festivall* is of so antient Institution, "*as primitively Catholick, if not Apostolick*, Seeing it hath beene made appear to be, neither 1. *Apostolicke*, or 2. a *Primitive Institution*, nor 3. Of *Catholick* observation, till at least the 400. yeare, by his owne confession.

2. That it is "*more than lawfull, pi-*

*ous*

"*ous in it selfe.* When at most, it is but a thing *Indifferent* in its use, and in its *Abuse*, by *Superstition* and *Willworship*, more than unlawfull; impious

3. That such an *Antient Institution* (if it were proved so) abused to *Superstition* and *profanesse*, may not by a particular *Church*, or Christian *Magistate* be lawfully abolished, without regard to the *Universall*, the *Universall* Church being never like to meet, or if they could (the greatest part being *Antichristian*) unlike ever to *consent* to the abolishing of it. Till the Doctor shall prove these things; a further answer is not needfull.

And so I come to his last question, which is this: "*Whither by any obligation* "*of conscience it appear necessary to be* "*thus abolished, on this onely ground, of* "*truth, because the following dayes have* "*sometimes beene mispent in riot* &c. *by* "*some wicked men.* But here again, the Doctor takes for *granted*, what hee hath not proved, *viz.* That the onely *ground* of truth, or onely *true ground* of *abolishing* this *Festivall*, was the Riot committed, in the following daies; whereas the principall *charge* against it was, the *Superstition*, and *Willworship*, attending the *observation*

*vation* of it; though the Riot and prophanesse of the following daies, might justly adde an *Aggravation* to them; and call for a *Reformation.*

And now, for a *conclusion* of all, wee shall make bold, to propound some *questions* to the Doctor, or any that shall undertake this cause; And they are these.

1. "*Whither any Church, nationall, or* "*universall* (*since the Apostles*) *have* "*power to institute any Religious Ceremo-* "*nies as parts of worship*, &c. (*as it is* "*propounded*, Sect. 9.) *and in particular*, "*this Festivall of Christmas, making it* "*a part of Divine worship, the day equally* "*holy as the Lords day*, &c. *and not be Su-* "*perstitious.*

2. "*Whither if any Humane Institu-* "*tion in the worship of God be abused to* "*Superstition, and prophanesse, it may not,* "*ought not to be abolished.*

3. "*Whither the Feast of Christmas* "*in speciall, hath not been abused to ri ot* "*and excesse by the most part of* vulgar "*people, and to* Superstition *also, by them,* "*and many* Divines, *and by the Doctor* "*himself.* if *Superstition* be an *excesse* of Religion, as we have proved it to be.

4. If so, then, "*Whither it was not ne-* "*cessary for such as have power in their hands,*

"*hands, to abolish such an Institution*; as *Hezekiah* did the *brazen* Serpent (which had a better *Originall* and Author) for the *Superstition* and *Idolatry* cleaving to it; and as Saint *Paul* did the *Agapæ*, the *Lovefeasts* for the *prophanesse* crept into them.

*D. Rivet in Exod.* 20. *pap.* 205. *a.*

Hic existimamus Regulam illam habere locum: "*Adiaphora non necessaria, horrenda Idolomania pollnta, esse abolenda.*

---

# *FINIS.*

---

# *Errata.*

Pag. 1. l. 2. for *Translation*. r. *Tractation*. l. 18. for *all* r. *ill*. l. 19. for *work and worker*. r. *worm and canker*. p. 2. l. 14. *put in First*, *before Table*. p. 3: l. 8. for *partly* r. *particularly*. p. 4. l. 12. r. *defines* p. 17. l. 21. for *since* r. *sinne*. p. 10. may r. *Superstitiosiores*. l. 19. r. *others worshiped*. p. 19. l. 4. *a fine dele a God*. p. 25. r. l. 3. for *when*, r. *then*. p. 27. l. 1. for *their*. r. *then*. l. 3. r. *institution*. l. 4. for *our* r. *one*. p. 28. l. 12. for *hear they*. p: 30. l. 5. for *matter* r. *rather*. l. 9. *put in*, *must dist*. l. 5. a f. r. *Math*. 15. p. 41: l. 19. for *not*. r. *but*. p. 45. l. last. r. *context*. p. 46. l. 6. a f. for *toiles* r. *wiles*. p. 41. l. 18. r. *Teachers*. p. 45. l: 20. for *these* r. *the*. p. 52. l. 23. for *there* r. *here*. p. 65. l. 17. r. *therefore*. p. 66. l. 2: r. *transform*. p. 69. l. 1. r. *outdated* p. 78. l: 18. for *lo*. r. *Lord*. p. 81. l. 9. r. *abhorres*. l. 18. r. *hear*. p. 82. l. 5. a f. r. *among* p. 84. l. 11. r. *voiding*. p. 85. l. 3. r. εκούσων & l. 14 εκουσια p. 86. l. 11. r. *works*. l. 19. r. *Hasidim*. p. 88. l. 12. r. *contradistinction*. p. 96. l. 8. *a* f. r. *distinction*. p. 98. l. 12. for *now*, r. *nor*. l. 22. for *his* r. *this*. p. 100. l. 5. for *again* r. *often*. l. 8. for *we* r. *he*. p. 102. l. 3. a f. for *there* r. *this*. p. 108. l. 13. for *traje*, r. *trash*. so. l. 16. p. 111. l. 4. for *rod*, r. *rode*. p. 113. l. 17. r. *binds*. p. 116. l. 7. a f. r. *affirming*. p. 119. l. 3. r. *Karai*. Title pag. at end for *vincimur*, r. *vincuntur*. p. 123. l. 6. after mnde; put in, a double inference. p: 129. l. 11. for *above*. r. *about*. p. 132. l. 3. a f. for *plead*, r. *placed*. p. 166. for *raising*, r. *ruining*. p. 167. l. 17. for *distr*. r. *destruction*. p. 175. l. 2. *a fine*, for *is* r. *as*. p. 176. l. 1. for *Fast* r. *Feast*. l 13. put in I.